

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE National Sunday School Union is an enterprising body. It certainly cannot be accused of being behind the times. Its directors keep closely in touch with the developments of modern educational theory, and in its stream of literature we are getting constant evidence of the alertness with which the needs of youth, and teachers of youth, are being met. One of its latest enterprises is *Youth and Life*, which is described (perhaps somewhat extravagantly) as 'the most important volume on youth yet published.' It is important, and valuable, even if the superlative be avoided. Every aspect of the life of youth is dealt with by competent hands. Dr. SALEEBY (on the Body), Professor LOFTHOUSE, Canon RAVEN, Canon S. C. CARPENTER, Principal GARVIE, Professor J. A. FINDLAY, and Dr. W. R. MATTHEWS are among the writers. The book is edited by Mr. Ernest G. Braham, and costs 3s. 6d. net (paper, 2s. 6d.).

The essay which will at once attract the discerning reader is that on 'Youth and the Faith,' by Dr. MATTHEWS. Anything Dr. MATTHEWS writes commands attention, for he is one of the ablest, most original, and most convincing among those who are guiding the thought of the Christian community to-day. He starts by deprecating a suspicion which the phrase 'the Faith' may arouse in the mind of youth. There is a suggestion in it of authority which youth to-day resents. Youth wants freedom and adventure in the realm of mind, and does not want to be told what to believe, or

to have thrust on it 'what our fathers believed.' Dr. MATTHEWS concedes this, but suggests at the outset that authority may have a place and yet not be a fetter on the mind. To this he returns later.

There is another point of view, however, from which the Faith may expect to get a more respectful hearing from the present generation than from the last. We are getting a little tired of that kind of religion which is so undogmatic that it makes no statements at all, and even the young among us are becoming convinced that we cannot be saved by 'uplift.' They demand that something should be affirmed about which they can make up their minds. A religion that has not something clear to say about God will not exist long in our modern world. Every religion that has lasted has stood for some view of the universe and the place of human life in it. Christianity is no exception. It has a distinctive conception of God and man and history. This conception is summarized in what we call the Christian Faith.

What, then, is the Faith thus generally described? Are not the differences among Christians so great that it is absurd to speak of 'the' Christian Faith? These differences exist. Religious men of former days did not wrangle and fight about nothing. But they have been exaggerated by the theologians, who were naturally interested in their subject, and by the enemies of Christianity for their



own very different purposes. If we look at the Christian world we can say that the vast mass of Christian people agree on the most important affirmations of their creed. Their disputes are about matters of great importance, but not of the first importance. One of the supreme needs of our day is to see what *are* the big things, and to see their size, and to realize the comparative unimportance of everything else. Paul said: 'Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but'—something else which he describes in various ways. If we could only see the bigness of the great things we should solve many of our problems.

What, then, we ask again, *are* the big things? First, the reality of God. And by God we mean not a 'life-force,' or a principle, or a tendency, but the Creator of all things. And this Creator God is personal in the sense that He enters into moral relations with men. Further, His nature is redeeming love, and the loving purpose of the Creator was revealed supremely in the person, life, and work of Jesus Christ. Most Christians are agreed that in Christ we have the most complete revelation of God in human life, and that He is therefore the central figure in human history. It is their conviction that only through Him can the world be saved from its present condition of misery, bewilderment, and futility. And, further, that Jesus Christ was not 'holden of death,' but is alive for ever more, so that His cause can never be defeated. Finally, that there exists a community or fellowship, founded by Christ, which differs from all other communities in that it is the peculiar sphere of the activity of God's Spirit, so that normally the full Christian life can only be lived in that fellowship.

That is Dr. MATTHEWS' summary of what is held in common by those who call themselves Christians. Doubtless there is much more on which the majority of Christians would agree. But these are the beliefs on which the consensus of Christians is overwhelming. 'These affirmations are the core of the Christian Faith. No one could justly argue that they are vague. We may not understand them completely, . . . but they can be sharply

contrasted with other views of the world. . . . If they are true they are the most important matters we know.' It is of great interest to see what Dr. MATTHEWS presents to youth as the core of the Christian Faith. But is this statement satisfactory? Is this the core of the Christian Faith? If we read over again Dr. Matthews' summary we cannot help seeing that it would obtain the assent of earnest Unitarians. This may not be an objection. But in that case 'Christian' must be understood to include 'Unitarian,' and this is an inclusion which many, not unduly narrow, Christians would decidedly repudiate.

The point is of vital importance at the present day. Do we stand, as Christians, for the Deity of Christ in the full sense? No doubt that belief can be found in the statement Dr. MATTHEWS makes. But so can a very real and spiritual humanism. It is possible also to say that this formula of Dr. MATTHEWS is the true way of approach to the full truth for youth, that we must lead them along the lines of Christ's humanity. That may be true also. And it may be urged that 'deity' in Christ is just what Dr. MATTHEWS describes as the place of Christ in relation to God on the one hand and in history on the other. At any rate, we quote Dr. MATTHEWS' presentation of the Christian Faith as the way a very capable and believing theologian would present Christianity to the youth of to-day. The point is worth thinking over. We do not wish to deny to the best type of Unitarian the name of 'Christian.' But the word is often used in a sense that has no relation to belief, and applied to those who have a Christian 'spirit' or 'mind.' It is, however, Christian *belief* that is in view at present. And the question Dr. MATTHEWS' words will raise in many minds is this: Is 'Christian' in the phrase 'Christian Faith' to be used in a sense that will delimit it from Unitarian, or is it to be wide enough to embrace this?

St. Paul found the Christless multitude of his day 'having no hope and without God in the world. Twilight had fallen upon the ancient gods, and



with the loss of faith there followed disillusionment and despair. While the Stoic preached defiance of fate, and the Epicurean counselled men to snatch what enjoyment they could, all were agreed that suicide was an ever-open door of escape from the ills of life. Yet this dismal state became a negative preparation for the gospel. The preaching of salvation through Christ came like a new dawn, and there were many who gladly 'fled for refuge to the hope set before them.'

---

Is history repeating itself in our day? Following upon the glowing optimism of the nineteenth century there is falling upon the world a blight of disillusionment. The certainty of human progress and of a triumphant issue for human history is now openly derided, and we hear influential voices like that of Bertrand Russell counselling men to build on the only sure foundation of 'unyielding despair.' Will man be satisfied with this negative creed? Will he be content to abandon all hope for ever, or will his very despair lead, as in former times, to a great revival of faith and a new era of the gospel?

---

These reflections are naturally suggested by the reading of Oswald SPENGLER's *Man and Technics* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), a book of unrelieved gloom. SPENGLER is widely known as the author of 'The Decline of the West,' which has so profoundly influenced modern thought, particularly in Germany. In his view, our modern civilization is an organism which has passed its prime and is fast hastening to the grave. He has only contempt for the 'trivial optimism' of the nineteenth century, whose 'imbecilities make one shudder.' 'At last, with the twentieth, we have come to a century that is ripe enough to penetrate the final significance of the *facts* of which the totality constitutes *world-history*. Interpretation of things and events is no longer a matter of the private tastes of individuals of a rationalizing tendency, or of the hopes and desires of the masses. The place of "it shall be so" and "it ought to be so" is taken by the inexorable "it is so," "it will be so." A proud skepticism displaces the sentimentalities of last century. We have learned that history is something that takes no notice whatever of our expectations.'

Obviously this is an utter negation of God and hope. Let us strip off all illusions and face the naked truth. 'Man was, and is, too shallow and cowardly to endure the fact of the *mortality* of everything living. He wraps it up in rose-coloured progress-optimism, he heaps upon it the flowers of literature, he crawls behind the shelter of ideals so as not to see anything.' But such optimism is despicable cowardice. The grim fact is that all life is strife, and that man is a beast of prey. The beast of prey is 'the highest form of mobile life,' fighting, mastering, devouring. And, according to SPENGLER, 'it imparts a high dignity to Man, as a type, that he is a beast of prey.' He 'knows the intoxication of feeling when the knife pierces the hostile body, and the smell of blood and the sense of amazement strike together upon the exultant soul.' Nature is the great antagonist against whom man fights continually, a proud and resolute rebel. But Nature is too strong for him, and the end is inevitable defeat.

---

Of this inevitable end the signs are multiplying in our time. 'A weariness is spreading, a sort of pacifism of the battle with Nature. Men are returning to forms of life simpler and nearer to Nature; they are spending their time in sport instead of technical experiments. . . . There is beginning, in numberless forms—from sabotage, by way of strike, to suicide—the *mutiny of the Hands against their destiny*, against the machine, against organised life, against anything and everything. . . . The innumerable hands of the coloured races—at least as clever, and far less exigent—will shatter the economic organization of the whites at its foundations. The accustomed luxury of the white workman, in comparison with the coolie, will be his doom.' Moreover, in these last days, things are moving to a decisive issue with fearful rapidity. 'Truly the tempo of history is working up tragically. Hitherto thousands of years have scarcely mattered at all, but now every century becomes important. With tearing leaps, the rolling stone is approaching the abyss.'

---

Faced with such a destiny there is only one attitude which is worthy of us—the heroic defiance



of despair. 'Already the danger is so great, for every individual, every class, every people, that to cherish any illusion whatever is deplorable. Time does not suffer itself to be halted; there is no question of prudent retreat or wise renunciation. Only dreamers believe there is a way out. Optimism is *cowardice*. We are born into this time and must bravely follow the path to the destined end. There is no other way. Our duty is to hold on to the lost position without hope and without rescue.' It may well give food for very serious thought that in this twentieth century of the Christian era such a creed of despair should be preached in the heart of Christendom.

This same mood of pessimism is dealt with by Dean INGE in a lecture entitled *The New Twilight of the Gods* (Longmans; 1s. net). The title is, of course, taken from the old Scandinavian legend which predicted a final conflict between the powers of heaven and the realm of darkness, the issue of which was dubious. It was Spengler himself who suggested that the agnostic thought of to-day had brought on a new twilight of the gods which could only end in the blackness of universal night. Dean INGE surveys the problem from the point of view of astronomy and physics, which appear to exclude ultimate hope. According to the second law of thermodynamics, with which Eddington and Jeans have familiarized us all, the whole world is running down to extinction or some state nearly akin. Stars and planets, matter itself, together with all life, all civilizations, all ideals are doomed in the end to be reduced to one dead level of nothingness.

In his lecture Dean INGE considers 'how our scientists and philosophers react against this sentence of death, and what possible loopholes of escape have occurred to them.' None of these he finds entirely satisfactory, but he concludes with the reminder that 'for the Christian the prospect of the dissolution of the world is nothing new.' 'We must go back to the *philosophia perennis*,' which is as old as Plato. Time is but the moving image of eternity; it is only real as the vehicle of timeless values, which the Creator wills to be actualized in this medium. The Dean might have

added further that it is of the very essence of the Christian faith that man by grace may be redeemed from the world of time and change to find his true home in the eternal. Progress and Redemption are antithetical. When times are prosperous then progress is the watchword and man indulges in illimitable hope, but when times are evil and grim facts force themselves upon his notice, then man must either sink into a despairing pessimism or rise up to lay hold on the hope of Redemption. Surely, then, it becomes the high duty and privilege of the Christian Church to answer the growing pessimism of our time by preaching the gospel, not in terms of evolution—an idea foreign to the thought of the New Testament—but in terms of Redemption *solī deo gloria*.

The Westminster Shorter Catechism begins on a high plane. Indeed, we may agree with the late Professor Benjamin B. WARFIELD (whose essay on 'The First Question of the Westminster Shorter Catechism' has been recently reprinted in the sixth volume of his collected essays, entitled *The Westminster Assembly and its Work*), that no Catechism begins on a higher plane. The opening question and answer are very familiar: 'What is the chief end of man?' 'Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him for ever.'

What is the proximate source of this question and answer? It is the corresponding question and answer in the Westminster Larger Catechism, which was compiled immediately before the Shorter Catechism. The question in the Larger Catechism takes the form, 'What is the chief and highest end of man?' and the answer, correspondingly, 'Man's chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy Him for ever.' It may be observed that the question and the answer in the Shorter Catechism are crisper and stronger than the question and the answer in the Larger Catechism.

What is the ultimate source of the declaration of the Catechisms? It is the brief compend of religious truth, drawn up on the basis of his 'In-



stitutes,' which Calvin made public in its French form in 1537, or, rather, the catechetical document known as 'Calvin's Catechism,' which was published in 1545. There, as in the compend, the exordium is a declaration that men have been created for the very end of knowing God, and in knowing Him of glorifying Him, and in glorifying Him of finding their happiness in Him. Here, remarks Dr. WARFIELD, is the root which has borne the fruit of the opening question of the Westminster Catechism.

It is not to be imagined that these ideas were the invention of Calvin. They were the property of every Christian heart, and especially of all who had learned in the school of Augustine. The Westminster Divines had tradition enough behind them as they sat down to frame the first question and answer of their Catechisms. The tradition does not, however, quite account for the first

question and answer; and it may well be that the Westminster Divines found for themselves—as Leo Judae, Gagliardi, and Ames had done before them—a felicitous brief expression for Calvin's thought.

Dr. WARFIELD claims for the first question and answer that it brings to concise expression the whole Reformed conception of the significance of human life. Justice is not done to that conception if we say merely that man's chief end is to glorify God. According to the Reformed conception, man exists not merely that God may be glorified in him, but that he may delight in this glorious God. Man is not merely the object on which God manifests His glory, he is also the subject in which God's glory is perceived and delighted in. Every page of Calvin, it is averred, rings with the note of personal joy in the Almighty, who is the All-wise and the All-loving too.

---

## Professor B. W. Bacon.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., NEW YORK.

IN his review of the contribution made by America to New Testament science (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlii. pp. 265 f.), Dr. Easton last year observed that 'in Synoptic criticism America is justly proud of a scholar of supreme ability, Dr. Bacon,' and pronounced his book on *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* to be 'naturally the most important work' in this department of study. Dr. Benjamin Wisner Bacon died on the 1st of February, aged seventy-two. It is four years since he retired from his chair at Yale Divinity School, after a long service of thirty-one years. His health was not good, but he managed even in retirement to produce literary work, till his friends dared to hope that he might live to complete what he himself regarded as the crown of his labours, a Life of Jesus. This was not to be. He died suddenly, leaving a real blank for those who knew him as more than an author.

Professor Bacon was a man for whom you felt affection as well as admiration. He was in the best sense of the phrase a scholar and a gentleman. His courtesy and kindness were unailing, even to pacifists and fundamentalists, whom he exposed

and endured; he was a teacher who could inspire his pupils as well as instruct them, and while he held some definite opinions on theology and other topics, which he never concealed, he was one of the most generous of debaters, free from any littleness or pique. Besides this, he was not merely a true scholar, but productive more than most of his fellows. Articles and books poured from his pen upon the subject of Biblical criticism, particularly in the field of the New Testament. It is true that he began his literary work by an incursion into the field of Old Testament criticism. Between 1888 and 1895 he published the *Genesis of Genesis*, the *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, and a translation of Wildeboer's *Origin of the Old Testament Canon*. The burning question at that time was the problem of literary and historical criticism in relation to the Old Testament, and Dr. Bacon, then a Congregational minister, applied himself to an exposition of the Wellhausen ideas. But his appointment in 1897 to the Buckingham Chair of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation at Yale University, of which he was a graduate, transferred his interest to



the New Testament, though it did not alter the method of his work, which was primarily devoted to literary and historical criticism.

At the close of the preface to his first book on Genesis, Dr. Bacon wrote: 'In the firm confidence that a general acquaintance with the discoveries claimed to have been made by the higher criticism in the Pentateuch can only conduce to the lasting benefit of His cause who said, "Thy Word is Truth," this volume is respectfully submitted to the Christian public.' A sentence like this strikes the keynote of all the work which he undertook. He had an uncompromising belief in the teaching ministry and in the higher critical study of the Bible as an aid to religious faith. When he began his work, the right to this had still to be fought for. In his books we find 'his lance, his battered shield, his uncontrolled crest,' for Dr. Bacon was an incisive, radical exponent of his critical creed, who never shrank from challenging the opponents of free criticism any more than he hesitated to attack his fellow-critics. I remember how he once whimsically remarked to me, after some acid attack upon himself, that he suffered from his relationship to Delia Bacon, his grandfather's sister. This erratic lady is no more than a name, if she is even so much as that, to modern readers, but eighty years ago she stirred the pool of literary criticism by maintaining that Shakespeare's plays were composed by a syndicate, including Raleigh, Spenser, and Francis Bacon, who sought dramatic form for a sort of liberal philosophy. Delia had died in a lunatic asylum in 1859, the year before Professor Bacon was born. But when his literary opinions on the New Testament shocked conservatives, some of them would maliciously point to the nest from which he had sprung. Yet, in a sane sense, he did inherit a love of freedom. His grandfather, Leonard Bacon, was a well-known defender of religious and political liberty in New England, who was not afraid of unpopularity, and nobly championed Henry Ward Beecher against calumny; even in old age, when, after the Civil War, German thought began to affect American religion, he took a liberal position with regard to the Biblical criticism of Colenso and Robertson Smith, as that mediated German neo-criticism. After serving as a Congregational minister in New Haven, he became a professor in the local school of Divinity. Mr. Bacon was a progressive orthodox theologian rather than a radical. His son, Leonard, Professor Bacon's father, was a Congregational minister who had a radical outlook. He, too, was a vigorous spirit, translated Père Hyacinthe, for example, in the

interest of the Old Catholic movement, and generally displayed a temper of mind which was by no means conventional. Thus Dr. Bacon was born into a family tradition of outspoken freedom, which in his own independent way he carried on. That way was to lie in critical research into the Bible rather than in ecclesiastical doctrine or polity, however. His 'uncontrolled crest' and intrepid plume were to be visible in the forefront of the advance made by Biblical criticism from the very first. In his little book on Inspiration, where he holds that Jesus 'perished as a martyr to a more living, free, and progressive interpretation of the Scriptures,' he writes this truly characteristic sentence upon the impulse to freedom and the good fight of progressive thought which Scripture conveys: 'The token of the sound of marching in the tops of the mulberry trees was not given to David's men to point out for them a safe camping-ground, but to prove that "Jehovah is gone out before you to smite the host of the Philistines".'<sup>1</sup> Dr. Bacon always kept the Philistines of his age in full view.

Apart from text-books like his successful *Introduction to the New Testament* (1900) and *The Making of the New Testament* (1912), on the general field Professor Bacon's three chief loyalties were to the criticism of St. Paul's Epistles, the Fourth Gospel, and the Synoptic problem. These form a synthesis

His published work on the Pauline literature begins with a *Commentary on Galatians* (1909), which followed up a less technical sketch of *The Story of St. Paul* (1904). The commentary belonged to 'The Bible for Home and School,' edited by Dr. Shailer Mathews, a series which was designed to do very much what the Cambridge Bible has done for British readers, but which, unfortunately, was never completed. Dr. Bacon's trenchant theory of Galatians required the Epistle to have been written to the South Galatian churches, the conference of Gal 2<sup>1-10</sup> being identified, not with Ac 15, but with Ac 11<sup>27</sup> &c. Occasional articles upon Paul followed but he did not return to the subject till 1921, when *Jesus and Paul* showed a broader and more synthetic sense of the position of the Apostle, due in large measure to researches into the Synoptic problem which had been engaging his mind. Dr. Bacon's chief interest in the Pauline problem really lay in two of its aspects. One was the historic connexion between the traditions of Acts and the rise of the Gentile mission; his hypothesis<sup>2</sup> was

<sup>1</sup> He opened to us the Scriptures, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Finally stated, in the light of the 'Western' text in the *Harvard Theological Review* (January and April 1919, April 1928). The sharp outline is drawn



based upon an intricate analysis of Acts which required 12 to precede 9<sup>32-11</sup><sup>18</sup> within a Cæsarean source overlapping and contradicting an Antioch source of 6-8, 13 f. The other was the influence of the Pauline theology upon the Johannine interpretation and its relation to the common Apostolic message. In pre-Pauline Christianity Dr. Bacon recognized a religion of the Spirit, even a gospel of reconciliation in the sense of 'glad tidings of peace with God, who had been estranged by the sin of the people, but had now given assurance of forgiveness to all that come to Him in the name of Jesus, participating by baptism in His self-dedicating death.'<sup>1</sup> Paul's new interpretation of this, as distinguished from the liberal Jewish view of Peter and the narrower view of James, marks the first theological statement of the faith, and, although it was by no means accepted by the Church at large, it exercised an influence even on types of teaching that issued from other sources. Thus, Mark's Gospel is composed from a Paulinist standpoint on the whole, whereas Matthew's reflects rather the Petrine position. As for the Fourth Evangelist, he 'has placed the key-stone in the arch whose piers are on the one hand the Pauline and post-Pauline Epistles, on the other the Synoptic narrative literature and Book of the Revelation.'<sup>2</sup> Such is in outline the scheme drawn up for the evolution of Christian thought within the New Testament, and Dr. Bacon's study of St. Paul was in the main dominated by a sense of the Apostle's contribution to this development.

The theme of *Jesus and Paul* is elaborated in *The Apostolic Message* (1925) and *The Story of Jesus* (1927), which are concerned with results rather than processes. Here he analyses the 'obscure, non-literary period which precedes all our surviving documents,' i.e. the twenty years after Calvary,

'Acts versus Galatians: The Crux of Apostolic History,' an article contributed in 1907 to the *American Journal of Theology* (pp. 454 f.), where misconception of the Apostolic age is ascribed to the author of Acts.

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus and Paul*, p. 109.

<sup>2</sup> *Jesus and Paul*, p. 199. Though he took a very different line, Dr. Bacon reached much the same conclusion as Schweitzer, namely, that in a real sense the Apostle Paul carried on the religious revelation of Jesus Christ. He even saw in Paul's teaching an anticipation of the incarnation-doctrine which the Hellenistic author of the Fourth Gospel afterwards developed. As he phrases it in *The Making of the New Testament* (p. 231), 'The Fourth Gospel, as its Prologue forewarns, is an application to the story of Jesus as tradition reported it of the Pauline incarnation doctrine formulated under the Stoic Logos theory.'

when the Apostolic message 'received expression only in oral form and (after the Oriental manner) was embodied in ritual' (baptism and the eucharist).<sup>3</sup> After this period the Pauline and other interpretations come. In valuing each of these, it is held, 'we must distinguish between their theology and their gospel.' Their gospel is essentially one. Thus 'the story of Jesus, as regards what He did no less than what He said, but especially including His self-devotion on the Cross, is to Paul a manifestation of the love of God,' and this is the element of Paulinism which the Fourth Evangelist grasped and set in its final form. The idiosyncrasies of the Pauline theology, according to Dr. Bacon, mean no departure from the organic gospel which underlay the Apostle's contemporaries and predecessors.

*The Beginnings of Gospel Story* appeared in the same year as the *Commentary on Galatians*. It is also a commentary, but not easy reading, for Dr. Bacon's literary form was not the commentary. Between this 'historico-critical inquiry into the sources and structure of the Gospel according to Mark' and the *Studies in Matthew* (1930), which was its sequel, he published article after article on the Synoptic problem. His dominant aims were to differentiate between the Apostolic tradition of eye-witnesses or anecdotes of preachers and the editing of this catechetical material by sub-apostolic writers who were swayed by special interests, including the Pauline interpretation. To reach the latter motives, apologetic and edifying, he analysed the Gospels into sources and editorial accretions with extraordinary subtlety. In technique he is at his best in the two masterpieces upon this problem. So far as Mark is concerned, Dr. Bacon practically completed his theory (dating it about A.D. 80) in *The Gospel of Mark, its Sources, Structure, and Date* (1926), accompanied by the pamphlet on *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* (1919). Mark's Gospel is of Roman origin, but the composition of Matthew's is attributed to Edessa and North Syria rather than to Antioch. This is one of the novel notions propounded with meticulous and recondite ingenuity by the author. Another is that, instead of positing Mark and Q as the primary sources for Matthew and Luke, we should replace Q by S, a special and larger source, which Matthew uses to supplement Mark, but which contained an independent narrative of the Passion, as may be recovered from Luke's presentation of it. Professor Bacon believes that before the Gospel of Luke some biographical treat-

<sup>3</sup> *The Apostolic Message*, pp. 414 f. His article upon 'Reflections of Ritual in Paul' (*Harvard Theological Review*, October 1915) is important in this connexion.



ment of the teaching material had arisen in the wake of Mark, but he will not agree that this pre-canonical 'Luke' was Luke himself. Neither will he admit that S ever bore the name of Matthew. How then, it may be asked, as indeed it was asked, did the canonical Gospel of Matthew ever come to wear that Apostolic name? If any one wishes to see Professor Bacon at the great height of his ingenuity, brushing aside the traditions that serve most other critics and elaborating a hypothesis of his own, let him read the arguments on this point in the *Studies in Matthew* (pp. 37 f. and 439 f.). There are, indeed, difficulties about the relation of the first canonical Gospel to the tradition of Matthew's authorship, but if S, the official Apostolic source, is so important as Dr. Bacon alleges, its authority seems to require a higher author than an unknown missionary, and there is still a case for the traditional theory. So at least some critics will continue to argue. Dr. Bacon guesses that 'Matthew' was some primitive Christian, who is unknown to us, however, and he is unmoved by any scepticism to the contrary.

On the Johannine problem he was equally speculative and radical. There was no 'Gospel according to St. John' for him. Neither the Apostle John nor even John the Presbyter survives his criticism of the literature and the traditions. His large book on *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* appeared in 1910, but it was preceded, as it was succeeded, by articles which touched one point after another of the Johannine problem, three of the latest being on 'The Sources and Methods of the Fourth Evangelist' (*Hibbert Journal*, October 1926), on 'The Mythical Elder John of Ephesus' (*ib.* January 1931), and on 'The Anti-Marcionite Prologue to John' (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1930, pp. 43-54). He always intended to follow up the book with a fuller and more closely knit interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Believing that 'Christianity, as it issues from the maelstrom of Oriental religions of personal immortality which contended for the adhesion of the Græco-Roman world, is a blend of Jewish messianist apocalypse with Hellenistic doctrines of redemption by incarnation of a divine Messenger,'<sup>1</sup> he saw in the Fourth Gospel an expression of the latter, which marked a classical stage in the evolution of the religion about Jesus. The manuscript of this book has been, fortunately, left in such a shape that it can be published under the title he had selected, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*. I understand that we may look for it next year. However, the fundamental

presuppositions of such a book are already laid in its predecessor of 1910. Dr. Bacon belonged to those who doubt the practicability of discovering sources in the Fourth Gospel. His clue to its canonical form lies in revision. Given a masterful editor or redactor, who composed the last chapter or appendix, and little more is needed to explain the canonical text with its dislocations or prosaic misunderstandings of the original gospel, which was composed by an Ephesian mystic who, in sketching the life of Jesus on earth, portrayed an ideal or beloved disciple from the revered life of the Apostle Paul. The redactor wishes to win a position for this Gospel such as other Gospels enjoyed, and, as this involved Apostolic origin, he cautiously suggests John as its author, so that by the middle of the second century the Fourth Gospel had canonical rank equal to that attained thirty years earlier by Matthew. Or, to put it otherwise, the Asiatic traditions are now set up against the Roman, though the redactor is careful, by inserting on his own account the story of Peter's denial (18<sup>14-18</sup>. 24-27), for example, to commend his work to Rome. The detailed discussion of the problem cannot be further followed, partly because it is scattered through so many articles. Till the long expected volume appears next year, fuller criticism had better be delayed, although it is not likely that there will be any material change in the literary hypotheses on which Dr. Bacon had already reached his conclusions.<sup>2</sup> The outstanding features of his Johannine method were, in the first place, that revision of an original source by an editor was the true axiom of research, and, secondly, that we must begin with the appendix.

Behind all Dr. Bacon's theories about the Gospels there lies a belief in the controversial motives that led to their canonization. Whether he is dealing with the Synoptic Gospels or with the Fourth, he refuses to discuss their interpretation, or to enter upon their analysis apart from the question why and how this particular Gospel won its place in the Canon. Second-century traditions, therefore, become important and even decisive for his theories. Again, at an earlier stage, owing to his firm grasp

<sup>2</sup> So at least one may infer from the article on 'The Sources and Method of the Fourth Evangelist,' contributed to the *Hibbert Journal* as recently as October 1926, which traces the affinities between that Gospel and Synoptic themes freely handled, and is still sceptical of any so-called 'Johannine' document or tradition. A slight change of view on Jn 21<sup>24</sup> is indicated, however, in one of his last articles (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1931, pp. 71-80).

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Matthew*, p. xi.



of the connexion between the Church and its tradition, the very composition of the Gospels is placed within the seething world of primitive Christian thought and practice; tendencies which escape the eye of the superficial reader are discovered behind this saying or paragraph and that; Dr. Bacon has a fertile imagination, and he exercises it lavishly in his intricate, ingenious reconstruction of the currents and cross-currents which are supposed to flow underneath various sections of the primitive tradition. The general position is sound, and, as he states it, is acceptable enough. But while his books provide material along these lines which no serious worker can afford to neglect, every student will sift them carefully. It is too soon to predict how far any of his theories will command general assent. But this may be said, that the study of his critical work is not only profitable but enjoyable on account of two qualities; one is the dashing, slashing criticism of traditions ancient and modern, and the other is the love of building up a positive hypothesis upon some allusion or allusions which have hitherto been rejected of the builders, as being either too precarious or insignificant. It is never safe to ignore Dr. Bacon in either mood. With regard to the former point, readers should bear in view that his full mind upon the Fourth Gospel is not to be found in the 1910 book. There he is conscious, perhaps too conscious, of conservative antagonists. The sustained effort to present his own radical thesis against other critics forces him to appear somewhat controversial. The spirit of controversy is never more out of place than when a writer is handling the Fourth Gospel, and Dr. Bacon was well aware of this. He makes up for the more negative emphasis when he comes to write the two closing chapters of his *Jesus and Paul*, where he contends that the Ephesian evangelist held up 'to the world the spiritual Christ of Paul' and composed a writing which 'surely deserves to be considered the great Christian product of his age, perhaps the greatest of any age.' It is the same in dealing with the other Gospels. The reader who may find a certain artificiality in the bloodless ballet of R, Q, S, P, and their company cavorting through single, double, and triple traditions, as Dr. Bacon presents the drama of these days, must recollect that he, at any rate, believed in a living order of religious thought behind these abstruse and unattractive literary symbols, and that he sought to reach past manuscripts to movements if not to men. His technical style occasionally prevents him from doing justice to himself in this matter. The truth is, that in all these interpretations Dr. Bacon

was moved by a keen desire to recover the real message of Jesus. It was this conviction, the conviction that here lay the vital thing for religion, to-day as well as yesterday, that explained his controversial attacks upon what he used to call 'the accumulated inertia of eighteen centuries of unquestioning tradition,' and also, in a more positive aspect, the measured enthusiasm with which he now and then wrote for students who were entering the Christian ministry. A book like his lectures upon *Jesus the Son of God* (1930) shows that for him this interest in meticulous analysis of books and in novelties of historical criticism was no mere academic exercise. He tells his hearers that they must give leadership to a generation which will not be instructed 'by parroted tradition.' 'It is of no use to call the generation perverse, adulterous, and faithless. It may be so, but telling it so will be of small avail. Your part will be to give it ideals to which to commit its life now too often wildly wasted; and your supreme resource, your gospel for an age of disillusionment, must be the life that was sacrificed on Calvary.' He then proceeds in four lectures to indicate how a thoroughly critical use of the Gospels provides such a message, agreeing with Troeltsch that 'the early Church's religion of Christ and redemption is a result which arose out of the impression made by Jesus Himself and which is inwardly continuous with His Person.' The test of a theology lies in this, can it be preached? Dr. Bacon's critical analysis of the New Testament literature involved a theology, and he did not hesitate to declare that it not only could be, but must be, preached. *Jesus the Son of God* is the most genial book he ever wrote. In one aspect, it is the positive counterpart of his preliminary studies in the literature of primitive Christian revelation, whilst in another it illustrates a side of the author which readers of the earlier and severely critical monographs sometimes fail to appreciate. No doubt it has been said that the religious message which he evolves cannot be based with any security upon his radical criticism, or that, even if it can, it is inadequate to the needs of Christian discipline and doctrine. Yet Dr. Bacon was convinced of his reconstruction. I should judge that one of his true services has been to adhere afresh to the principle which to-day is more dominant than ever in New Testament criticism, that account has to be taken of an original common or Catholic faith, if either the Apostle Paul or the Gospels are to be estimated accurately. More than that, his adherence was not simply formal, but due to a real appreciation of the religious values in



that common faith as it drew upon Jesus the Lord.

With regard to the second point, his fertility of imagination, whether it produces a flash of insight or a fantastic idea, is the inevitable complement of his scepticism, so far as most accepted Church traditions of the second century were concerned. The course of Christianity between A.D. 30 and 130 is more obscure than many realize. There are gaps, and if tradition is to be queried or cast out something has to be substituted. The risk is that modern speculation, when engaged upon this legitimate task, substitutes something which is either less or more simple than the original sequence is likely to have been. Commonly it is less simple, as with Dr. Bacon's theory. Samuel Butler in a witty taunt declares that 'the Deity cannot alter the past, but historians can and do—perhaps that is why He allows them to exist!' This is the kind of gibe which is often levelled against reconstructions of the primitive Church such as Dr. Bacon's treatises provide. He alters the course of the history, for example, as written in our canonical Acts. Which he has a perfect right to do, since, on his showing, Luke altered it in the first century by placing Peter's preaching to non-Jews before instead of after the Jerusalem Council.<sup>1</sup> Again he elaborates a theory of the five-fold structure of Matthew's Gospel, each teaching section being introduced by a narrative. But the theory has to force evidence in order to establish itself, till some readers feel, as they do with regard to the Acts-criticism, that an imaginative idea is being allowed to rearrange the

extant evidence unduly. Even granted that Acts, for example, has presented the course of the early Church in a manner not exactly corresponding to the actual sequence of events, the question may be raised, is this clever presentation by a modern more plausible than, say, the traditional? Such a query may be obscure, but not necessarily so. Furthermore, it is a fair question which some of Dr. Bacon's most appreciative critics have dared to ask. Even if such theories are legitimate, have we sufficient evidence to justify us in accepting or in rejecting them? And supposing that the tradition of the religion of Jesus underwent sea-changes in the first century, such as is assumed, can they be determined so definitely as Dr. Bacon alleges? Furthermore, if there was a common gospel, is it not simpler to assume that its essential content could assimilate forms of expression from the changing environment, without having to posit such motives as are speculatively attributed by our author?

Yet, however his theories may be judged, the two main books by which Dr. Bacon will probably be remembered carry a weight that is not affected by their speculative buttresses. His *Gospel of Mark* and the *Studies in Matthew*, perhaps with the addition of the posthumous book on the Fourth Gospel, are almost certain to hold a permanent place among the foremost scientific works upon the New Testament which our generation has produced. They are rich in suggestiveness and coherent argument, as well as in historical perspective. Often they contain brilliant exposition of the documents, and, whatever be the verdict upon their particular theories, they set forth the relevant data with a power that proves the author's grasp of the entire subject.

<sup>1</sup> The ingenious explanation of Luke's motives and methods at this point, in the *Harvard Theological Review* (1921, pp. 149 f.), starts as many problems as it seeks to solve.

## Fatherhood and Sonship in the Fourth Gospel.

BY PRINCIPAL W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D., HANDSWORTH, BIRMINGHAM.

AMONG the various New Testament problems, that of the Fourth Gospel easily holds a place in the first rank for interest and fascination. There is hardly a single possible theory of its authorship and its source that has not found a capable advocate. Where definite and authoritative evidence is so conspicuously lacking, the field is all the more open for ingenious combinations and subtle suggestions.

The idea that it can be regarded, however, as first-hand evidence for the actual teaching of Jesus is now almost universally given up. Manson, in his recent work on the teaching of Jesus, quotes with approval the words of H. Latimer Jackson: 'The modern student cannot but feel that to turn from the Synoptics to the Fourth Gospel is to breathe another atmosphere, to be transported to another



world.' And, he adds, 'so it comes about that . . . the Gospel has to be set apart as a special and highly complex problem on its own account.'

True, whatever be its sources or its history, it is one of the great religious books of the world. No one would dream of placing any Hellenistic writings on the same level of religious insight; and if it lacks the vigour, the movement, the fascinating personal appeals of Paul, the measured and rhetorical contracts and expositions of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the vivid pictures and narratives of the Synoptics themselves, it reveals a unity and a concentrated force in the presentation of its one great though many-sided thesis which neither Paul nor the author to the Hebrews can equal.

What is this thesis? Quite briefly, it is that the Father sent His Son into the world to enable men to become the sons of God. Men become sons of God through knowing Him; and they know Him through the Son, who is the Light and the Way; who is Truth and Life; who is one thing with the Father, and whose will is that men should come to share that oneness. That oneness is received when men believe on the Son; that is, when men take as theirs His way or rule of life (His commandments) and His conception of the Father; thus they will abide in His love.

Such is the framework on which the whole Gospel is constructed. Its ideas are all expressed in the Prologue, in which, to adopt a musical metaphor, the author collects his *leitmotifs*. It is true that he there uses an expression for Christ which does not occur elsewhere in the Gospel. He discards it almost at once. The Son is the Logos; but by his use of that expression, he appears to intend to say, 'What Philo called the Logos, and no more than the Logos, was really much more; the Logos took flesh; He was the Son, making clear, as none ever had done or could do, in the conditions of our human existence, the whole mind and redemptive purpose of God, His Father; namely, that we should ourselves be enabled to become the sons of God.'

It is the purpose of this paper to argue that in his presentation of the Christian doctrine, of which the centre is the relation between the Father and the Son, the Fourth Evangelist is dependent on the actual teaching of Jesus; that in the Fourth Gospel we have a source of the highest value for that teaching, even if we cannot claim that, for that reason, the words and acts attributed to Jesus are in any strict sense historical; that the Johannine conception of the relation between the Father and the Son was in fact central in the teaching of Jesus;

and that other teachings about Jesus in New Testament writings must be examined in their relation to this cardinal tenet.

What is the Johannine conception of the Fatherhood of God? Was it that of the Old Testament? God is referred to as a Father in the Old Testament, but only with caution. In God's relation to the world, He appears as Creator and Ruler; and in His relation to Israel He is King, Judge, Deliverer. He shows to His people the same righteousness and mercy that He demands from them, but of course in a far higher degree than can ever be expected of them. But, in the main, it is to the nation that He designs to be like a father, or in place of a father. It is only as an exception that a prophet (if it be a prophet) will cry, 'doubtless thou art our father'; and though occasionally the purely national application may be left behind ('like as a father pitieth his children, so Jahveh pitieth them that fear him'), yet a definite fatherly relation to individuals must be held to be foreign to general Old Testament ideas. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the connotation of the terms father and son was different to the Hebrews, and to the Semites in general, from what it has been to the Western nations. To us, the relationship between father and son is chiefly physical. Even if the father is neglectful, or the son unnatural, the physical bond is still there; they are still father and son. With the Hebrews, on the other hand, the two terms, and especially 'son,' are used when a physical relationship is out of the question, and where the son is so called because he is the representative, the manifestation, the embodiment of him, or of that, of which he is said to be the son. We can talk of a son of peace, of worthlessness (Belial), or of consolation. And we should probably understand in this sense the phrase 'sons of God,' *Bne Elohim*, if it does not carry us back to the realms of mythology.

Next, when we turn to the Synoptists, God is regularly called Father, without any qualifying preposition—'like' or 'in the place of.' On the other hand, it is doubtful whether Jesus ever speaks of God as the father of all men as such. The phrase, 'Your Father which is in heaven' (especially common in the Sermon on the Mount, as in the familiar words, 'When ye pray, say, Our Father') seems addressed to those who have already entered into a relation to God distinct from that of ordinary men. The same is true of the other passages in the Sermon on the Mount which refer to God as Father. The doctrine of the general Fatherhood of God has indeed been deduced from the doctrine



of Providence in Mt 6. But the power which makes the sun to rise on the evil and the good and sends the rain on the just and the unjust is not there called the Father; if the wants of men are supplied, so are the wants of animals and birds; and while that power watches the sparrows fall, it does not prevent them falling. Outside Mt 6 and in one other passage referred to below Jesus very rarely, in the Synoptics, uses the term Father of God, save as 'my Father'; and there is no instance where the relation is quite clearly general. To conclude from the parable of the Prodigal Son that Jesus taught that God is the Father of all men, would certainly be to strain the interpretation. Or, if God is the Father of men, it is conduct of a certain kind, such as love to enemies, that makes men what they were not before, His sons ('that ye may be sons of your Father . . .') (Mt 5<sup>45</sup>).

But this is a paradox, and plainly points to some further and more explicit teaching. Its paradoxical character, indeed, may be inferred from the common belief that in the Synoptists Jesus teaches that God is the loving Father of all men, providing as such for their wants to be supplied: a view of Divine Fatherhood, however, which would seem to be as alien to the Synoptists as it is to the Fourth Gospel. To that Gospel it is now time to turn. What is the meaning of the term Father there, and of the term Son? For the two are clearly correlative terms. A father is the father of a son; a son is the son of a father. One cannot be properly understood without the other. And unless we are to think of a merely physical bond, arising out of a temporal act of procreation, which is equally far from the Biblical thought of fatherhood and from Christian theology, we must interpret the Divine Fatherhood and the Divine Sonship by what we can learn of the functions of the one in relation to the other. Now the author of the Fourth Gospel is quite well aware of this. To him, at all events, God is not the Father of all men indiscriminately: nor is anything said of His fatherly relations to them. How could this be, when the majority of men do not recognize Him as their Father, and are consciously in no sort of relation to Him at all? Whatever the relation actually implies, it is one which is peculiar to the Father and the Son. 'None knoweth the Son but the Father; none knoweth the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son is minded to reveal him.' These words indeed occur in the Synoptic tradition, though they can be paralleled several times in the Fourth Gospel. But the fact that they occur in this Synoptic tradition suggests that the conception of this correlation was

known to that earlier circle of disciples, and that it was caught from the Master's lips—glanced, as it were, though not fully comprehended. In the Fourth Gospel it is basal. The Son is *μονογενής*; unique, as the word should probably be translated; son in a special and quite distinctive sense.

When we ask what are the functions of Son and Father, the Fourth Gospel gives us materials for a full answer. Indeed, the whole weight of the author's contention is laid on the functional and (as we may even say) the practical rather than the metaphysical aspect of the relation. In the Divinity of Christ, as such, the author hardly seems interested. There is scarcely a reference to it between the first verse of the Prologue (and perhaps the eighteenth) and the confession of Thomas at the end of the work. But the whole book is occupied with the way in which the Father acts to the Son and the Son to the Father. The Father sends, the Son is sent; the Father speaks, the Son hears, and repeats; the Father acts, the Son sees, and acts likewise. That is but natural. Whatever fatherhood means, it means that the Father must take the initiative. He is supreme. And yet this supremacy passes almost immediately into equality, reciprocity, unity. Their purpose, their will, are the same. They live together in an atmosphere of unbroken mutual trust and love; each hears and heeds the other; each is said both to judge, and to leave judgment to the other; and when Christ returns from His manifestation in the flesh, to leave the Paraclete in His place, it is the Father who sends the Spirit in the name of the Son, and it is the Son who sends the Paraclete Himself. What one does, the other does; what one has, the other has also; and when, in what is called the 'high-priestly prayer' in the upper room, the author puts into the lips of Christ a summary of all that He has done and shared with the Father, the climax is 'even as we are one thing.' It may be that the author gives us no help towards proving Nicene or Chalcedonian definitions of Christ's person, or deciding whether there was one nature and one will, or two, in the Logos. Yet, if we may rest the Divinity of Christ on His Sonship, the whole book is a treatise on His Divinity.

But it is also a treatise on the nature of God. What we have said about reciprocity reminds us that what we know of the Son we also know of the Father. And just as Christ is pre-eminently the Son who is sent in order to bring men to God, so God is pre-eminently the being who desires men to become His Sons, and has sent Him who is His Son to enable them to share this sonship; to



become one thing with the Father and the Son, as they are already and from the beginning one together. The other attributes of God are treated as if they were relatively unimportant, or they are neglected. Of the relation of God to the world, in the Old Testament sense, very little is said. No stress is laid on God as Creator or Sustainer, as Omnipotent or as All-knowing. Nor is the author interested in what may be called the providential government of God as it may be studied in the Synoptics. There is no parallel to the passages about the birds and the flowers. Indeed, the reciprocity above described almost confines the activity and the will of God to what can be seen in the Word manifest in the flesh. Explicit as he is on this reciprocal relation, the author even turns from all the teaching, so clear and charming in the Synoptics, about the attitude of God, their 'father in heaven,' to the little flock. What he is above all anxious to make clear is the Father's relation, not to men, but to the Son.

On the other hand, the whole purpose of that Divine relationship between the Father and the Son is that men may become sons through the existing sonship of Christ. To say that God is not the Father of men does not mean that He is careless or neglectful of them, or that He is without mercy or grace. On the contrary, He is the very source of love and grace. He has shown His love and sent His grace by Christ. But until men have received Christ, God cannot be their Father in the full and generous sense in which the word is used in this Gospel. For there are not two kinds of fatherhood, any more than there are two kinds of sonship. We do not hear of a human sonship which enjoys a lower class of privilege than some divine sonship. On the contrary, in the 'high-priestly prayer' to which we have already referred, Christ pleads that those who believe on Him may have all that He has with God; already they have the words; now they are to have the glory and the unity which are properly His own. God's fatherhood is reciprocal; therefore no one can be a son who is not prepared to act as a son; that means, that He can be said to be the Father only of those who have received the gift of sonship through the Son, Christ, therefore, is the *μονογενὴς υἱός*, the unique Son, not because He is the only Son of God that there ever can be; nor because He has something that other sons cannot have; but because sonship with Him is eternal; He has been the Son as long as there has been a Father to have a Son. As such, He is the Mediator; the channel through which sonship is ours. And this

He secures, as the First Epistle makes clear, by saving us from sin, the fatal alienation of man from God—by cleansing us, as the author puts it, by His blood, by communicating Himself to us.

Let us now consider the place that the doctrine of Fatherhood and Sonship holds in the writings of Paul. Unlike John, Paul forces us, when we think of his writings, to think of himself and his history. We know him better than we know any New Testament character. His life is an open book. Yet it needs to be read with care. As A. S. Peake says, his original contribution to Christian theology grew directly out of his own experience. We must, therefore, bear in mind the development of that experience. Paul had escaped from the law—not so much the ritual as the moral law—'thou shalt not covet,' and the like. This escape had been effected through Jesus, whom he had seen on the road to Damascus, and whom he henceforth knew as Messiah and Lord. The Messiah had died (paradoxical thought) and (still worse) had been crucified; but He had been raised, and was to return. Paul makes very few allusions to the actual teaching of Jesus; but we can detect in his writings a distinct deposit of tradition as to the teaching and the life of Jesus, even of the *logia* in the Sermon on the Mount. On the other hand, there is a great deal in Paul which could not have come from Jesus. The reason for saying this is not merely because we do not find it attributed to Jesus in our existing sources, and therefore conclude that Jesus could not have said it; but because it is clearly derived (however modified) from the Pharisees, at whose feet Paul had sat, but with whom Jesus had nothing in common.

On the other hand, Paul has undeniably a definite conception of Jesus as the Son. What that conception was we shall see in a moment; but we must first note that it was hardly central. In large and important sections of his letters we miss any reference to Christ as the Son, and (where we might well have expected it) to ourselves as made sons through Him. And often where Christ is spoken of as the Son, nothing is made of what is implied by the appellation. It is but comparatively seldom that an argument can be said to rest for its strength on the fact that Christ was the Son, as distinct from the risen Lord, once on an equality with God, then humiliated, then exalted. In the two letters to the Thessalonians, the term 'Son' is only used once; in Galatians, in spite of two striking passages (to be referred to later), the main argument is independent of Christ's sonship, though the spirit of adoption is the spirit of 'his



son.' In Romans, there is hardly a reference to Christ as the Son between the first chapter ('marked out as the Son') and the eighth ('the death of his Son' [v. 16]). And after chap. 8 nothing more. In the letters to the Corinthians there are only three references ('the fellowship of his Son'; 'the Son himself shall be subject to the Father'; and 'the Son of God is not flesh and blood'); this is the more remarkable since the content of the two letters is so varied and so near to Paul's heart. In the remaining letters there is nothing but the two phrases, 'the recognition of the Son of God,' and 'the kingdom of the Son of his love.' On the other hand, God is five times spoken of as the Father of Jesus Christ; but the usual expression in such cases is 'God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.' Where a genitive follows 'Father,' it is usually 'our,' as in 1 Th 1<sup>8</sup>. Christians are indeed spoken of as 'children of God'; but the same term is often used of Paul's converts in relation to himself.

There are, however, three expressions which show that Christ's sonship lay deeper in him than in his language: it was in his heart, his experience. 'When it pleased God to reveal his son in me'; 'marked out as the Son of God with power'; and 'sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh' (which we may contrast in passing with John's director expression, 'the Word became flesh'). And further, 'the life that I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God.' The wonder is that such phrases are not far more frequent, and that in the passages in which he develops his great doctrine of redemption, he should be content for the most part with the term 'Christ.' When he is dealing with adoption or the sonship of believers, it is because we are sons that God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son; we are sons, not slaves (Gal 4<sup>6, 7</sup>). This recalls the Fourth Gospel, but the definiteness of the Gospel is absent here. In the similar argument in Ro 6, in opposition to the old slavery, we are said to be free men (not sons). In Ro 8, the Spirit is collocated with Christ; but our sonship comes through the Spirit (Ro 8<sup>9</sup>), and Christ is not mentioned in that particular context, save in the reminder that if we are heirs of God, we are joint-heirs with Christ (Ro 8<sup>17</sup>). True, we are destined to be 'conformed to the image of his Son'; but the creation waits not for the Son, but for the revelation of the sons, the glory of the children of God. And later, when Paul describes the relation of Christ to the Church and to the cosmos, he still makes no mention of the Son. It may also be noticed that in the many passages where Paul uses the preposition *διὰ* of

Christ (reminding us again of the Johannine doctrine of the Father revealed to men *through* the Son), the 'Son' is never the noun governed by the preposition. And Paul never makes use of the simple Johannine expression, 'the Son.'

It is thus clear that Paul was profoundly aware of the sonship of Christ; a sonship which was unique—as unique as in the Fourth Gospel; but it was only one of the aspects under which he thought of Christ. His thought is not homogeneous. Often, when we should have expected the term—where for us, with the Fourth Gospel in our minds it seems necessary for the argument—we miss it. Paul is as deeply convinced as is John that Christ is the Mediator; yet His mediating function is not connected with His sonship.

Let us now turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of sonship *par excellence*, as it has been called. Here also it will be of use to note the actual language of the work. The keynote is struck in the first sentence. God has finally revealed Himself to us in a Son—in terms of sonship, as we might render the words—through whom (a Johannine touch) He made the worlds, the ages. God uses one language to angels, another to the Son. Christ is not, like Moses, a servant, but a son. Melchizedek, a greater than Abraham even is 'made like unto the Son of God' (He 7<sup>3</sup>). The law sets up a human priesthood; the oath of God sets up a Son consecrated for ever (7<sup>28</sup>). Our high priest is Jesus the Son of God. Rejection of His message means crucifying the Son of God afresh or trampling upon Him (6<sup>6</sup> 10<sup>29</sup>). All this may remind us of John, as does the phrase, 'bringing many sons unto glory' (2<sup>10</sup>); and the believer is spoken of as a son; it is even as a son that he is chastened. If we were not so chastened, we should be no better than bastards (12<sup>8</sup>).

But this sonship of the believer is not, as in John, connected with the sonship as such of Christ. Further, though Christ is spoken of as Son, God is never called Father but once, and then as the Father of Spirits, not as the Father of Christ. The theological argument of the Epistle does indeed rest upon the sonship of Christ; but the term has no definite content. Christ is more than an angel, a priest, or a servant; He is a Son; but beyond assuming that a son is more than what is meant by these other terms, it is not analysed. To speak of rejecting Christ as trampling on the Son of God has a strong emotional and rhetorical appeal, but no theological significance. The practical significance of Christ as the Son is ignored. We are reminded in a very touching way that Christ



ffered, and learned obedience by His sufferings—thought that would never have been expressed by John; and it is because of His sufferings and temptations—the weaknesses that He shared with us, though without our sin—that He can assist us, not by His relation to the Father. Thus, while the author suggests John, he makes no use of Johannine suggestions. He has no doctrine of God's fatherhood of Jesus; and the term 'Son,' as applied to Jesus, is either a title conveying His majesty and awe and exaltation, or else the subordination and obedience that every earthly father expects of his son.

Our conclusion, then, with regard to this author is similar to our conclusion with regard to Paul. Sonship is more than peripheral; it is less than central. Not that this author borrowed his conception of sonship from Paul. He borrowed nothing from Paul. He has no doctrine of the Spirit; he makes next to nothing of the resurrection of Christ; and the Law is entirely different to him, in content and in purpose, from what it is to Paul. But, as with Paul, monotheism, as the Jews understood it, has broken down. Christ, as God's Son, if He is not thought of, as by Paul, as central in the life of the believer and the processes of the universe, is still far higher than any created being, heavenly or angelic. With Paul, however, sonship is only one of the categories under which Christ is contemplated; with this author, sonship is the main category; but its meaning has not been worked out, as it is in John. He uses the term to enforce his original ideas, not to interpret or develop them.

We are now in a position to grasp the difference between the Fourth Gospel and the rest of the New Testament. In the latter, as in the former, Christ is the Son of God; we *become* the children of God. But Christ is also the Saviour, the Redeemer; we owe our salvation to Him; but there is not yet a logical connexion between His sonship and His saving and redeeming power. The second can be, and generally is, expounded without a reference to the first. On the other hand, in John, Christ is primarily and pre-eminently the Son of the Father. From this relationship spring all the various functions of Christ. It is because He is the Son, and holds this unique relation to the Father, that He is the source of all our blessings. Now, what is the relation between these two sets of conceptions, the Johannine and those found in the rest of the New Testament? Can either be derived from the other? It is clear that the Pauline doctrine cannot be derived from the Johannine.

That would demand too daring a reconstruction of chronology. It is also clear that the Johannine cannot be derived from either the Pauline type or from the Synoptics. For while we can understand the almost but not quite isolated doctrine of Mt 11<sup>19</sup> and its parallels by the help of the far fuller statements of John, we could never have deduced those statements and what is involved in them from the laconic Synoptic passages. In Paul and Hebrews, the distinctive Johannine doctrine (for which the passage in Matthew might be taken as a text) does not appear. Sonship, as a correlative of fatherhood, is absent. Nor could the Johannine doctrine have come, as has so often been affirmed, from Philo or the Ginzas, for the reason that in these suggested sources it does not exist. What, then, is its origin?

Let it be remembered, first, that the thought of the Messiah as the Son of God, if not always central, is universal in the New Testament. So foreign is it to Jewish thought, in the sense in which all the New Testament writers understand it, of the historic and actually crucified Jesus, that it could not have been independently developed by them; there must have been a common source for it. Secondly, besides Mt 11<sup>19</sup>, we find elsewhere in the Synoptics language which implies that the sonship of Jesus is distinct from that of believers. Jesus speaks of 'my Father' and 'your Father' never of 'our Father.' Even in the Synoptics His relation to the Father is unique. What follows from these two considerations?

This, that Jesus Himself held and taught that He was *the* Son of God. If He did not, what other common source can be suggested? But in what sense did He hold and teach this? Three answers are possible: He held (1) that God is the Father of all men, but He was specially conscious that God's fatherhood was complete or mature in His own case. This is suggested by a good deal of the language of the Synoptics. (2) That He was the Son of God, *i.e.* in a specially close relation to God, but that He was *also* Saviour and Redeemer. This is the developed but unco-ordinated view such as is represented in Paul and, partly, in He. (3) That He was pre-eminently the Son, as God was the Father; and that all His work could be understood only through this relation to God. This is what we may call the Johannine type. Of these three answers, the third seems the only probable one. If Jesus stopped with the first type, how can we account both for the development in the Fourth Gospel, and for the other development in Paul and Hebrews, where the type is so advanced, and yet



not central? If those two latter writers had developed their views of sonship for themselves, surely they would have made more of them. And how can we account for the traces of the more developed view in the Synoptics themselves?

On the other hand, can we suppose that Jesus held some developed view of His own sonship, like that found in Paul, or in Hebrews, without making it any more central than it is with those two authors? Here the difficulty is a psychological one. It would be possible to think of some one else, a great and beloved teacher and a commanding influence on one's own life, under various aspects, such as Messiah, Redeemer, Son of God; but could an individual think of himself now as one of these, now as another? If, on the other hand, Jesus taught what we have called the Johannine type of doctrine about Himself, we can account for the other two types. For it is not a doctrine that is easy to grasp in its fulness, either for those who have grown up in the world of Jewish expectations of the Messiah, or for us who have been accustomed to think of Him also under other categories. The conviction that He was really the Son of God,

whatever that might imply, made its way successfully into the universal Christian mind. The circles from which sprang the Synoptic tradition did not fully understand it, though they preserved certain expressions which implied more than they had grasped. Possibly, in much of His public teaching, Jesus did not go much farther Himself. In the earliest preaching of the Church, as seen in Acts, it passed, as it were, under the surface. Paul and Hebrews caught something of its deeper significance; but they were working out their own problems, and they had their own experience; and they received the conception of sonship, and carried it farther, each in his own fashion, as it had found its way into the general Christian consciousness, and not as it came from Him. But if it was the Johannine type that He taught, at least to the inner circle, there were some, it would seem, in his entourage who understood; they preserved the type; thought out its implications; doubtless clothed it in language, at times, that He had not actually used; but when the time came, they delivered what they had received from the Master Himself.

---

## Literature.

### DEUTERONOMY.

EIGHT years ago Professor A. C. Welch published a book on 'The Code of Deuteronomy,' which has scarcely received in this country the attention which its importance deserved. He has now followed it up by a more elaborate volume on *Deuteronomy: The Framework to the Code* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net), which deals with the historical, hortatory, and poetical material which precedes and follows the Code. This somewhat chaotic material is baffling—its purpose and origin, and the relation of its various parts to one another and to the Code—and many scholars postulate for its explanation a series of editors. It is one of the many merits of Dr. Welch's study to have made it clear beyond a doubt that none of it is written *in vacuo*, but that all of it has a definite relation to situations in the historical life of the people and to the religious problems by which they were faced. The regulation, for example, which forbade intermarriage in Israel with heathen neighbours

assumes a new interest when the historical situation is discovered into which it can most reasonably be fitted.

The book discusses with such detail the implications of the sections with which it deals, and is packed so full of subtle argument, that it is impossible in a brief notice to give any adequate idea of the richness of its contents or even summarily to state the various conclusions reached. It is a book to be not only read but studied, and studied with something of the care with which it was written. Dr. Welch has prepared himself for his complicated task by a scrupulously careful examination of every syllable of his material and of the contributions of recent scholars—notably Hempel, Steuernagel, and Puukko—to its elucidation; but he has gone his own way, and he is not afraid to reach conclusions which differ from those of his predecessors. He has seen unity in passages which they have distributed among various editors, and passages which it has been the custom to assign to the experience of Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile



he has found it possible to refer to the siege of Samaria and the occupation of the land by the Assyrians (cf. 28<sup>27-37</sup>, 47-57). He is a firm believer in the value of the distinction between the second person singular and the second person plural as a criterion, broadly speaking, of diversity of origin—coincident with the change in the number is often a change in the temper or contents—though this seems to him a more insecure criterion in poetry than in prose.

Not the least striking part of the discussion is that on the relation of the Decalogue to the Code. The Decalogue 'did not and could not supply the content of the national religion. What it supplied was the norm or the necessary conditions to which that religion in all its further development must conform' (p. 21), while 'the leading purpose of the Code was to guide the life of the nation in the new conditions which it must meet in Palestine' (p. 54). 'Mere obedience to the Decalogue would have left Israel without guidance in its positive religion and its practical life. Mere obedience to the Code of Moses would have left these practices without a moral and spiritual kernel: they would have been a set of *mores*' (p. 35). The careful discussion of The Blessing of Moses (ch. 33), with its 'heart-breaking obscurities,' will be welcome to all students of that difficult chapter, for which Dr. Welch claims a date considerably earlier than that of Jeroboam II. His treatment of the conflicting traditions with regard to the route taken by the Hebrews in their approach to Canaan from the wilderness, and his statement of the view that the scene of Moses' death was opposite Ebal are particularly fine specimens of critical work.

This volume will be a revelation to English-speaking students of the complexity of the problems that surround the Book of Deuteronomy. 'The debate on Deuteronomy,' remarks Dr. Welch, 'is far from ended.' This book is not likely to end the debate, but it will do a very great deal to clarify the issue.

#### THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Professor C. H. Dodd, D.D., of Manchester, has given us a volume of absorbing interest in his commentary, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, in the Moffatt New Testament series (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). It is a long time since we read a commentary which held us so powerfully and which has so much light to throw on the difficulties of this Epistle.

Part of Professor Dodd's success is due to the fact that he has been studying and teaching the Epistle for more than twelve years; but it is still more accounted for by the way in which he seeks first 'to discover as exactly as possible what Paul meant, in his own terms,' and then to indicate the bearing of what Paul means 'upon our own experience, our own questions, our own thought.' 'Sometimes,' Professor Dodd remarks with candour, 'I think Paul is wrong, and I have ventured to say so.' He holds that 'if we may believe that such a (transcendent) God broke decisively into the course of events at that point of history which is marked by the coming of Jesus Christ, then the structure of Paul's argument holds.'

The short introduction is that of a master of his subject. With reference to the theory of two recensions, which is demanded by the literary and textual evidence, Professor Dodd holds that it is more probable that Paul wrote the long recension, and that it was cut down later, either by Marcion or by orthodox editors or copyists. On the vexed question of the destination of chapter xvi. he maintains an even balance between the claims of Rome and Ephesus, and suggests that the burden of proof rests on those who would set aside the tradition in favour of a conjecture. In view of this he thinks that we may be content 'to accept chapter xvi. (except the doxology) as an integral part of the epistle.'

It is impossible in this brief notice to do anything like justice to the clarity and freshness of the exegesis. A very interesting discussion is given on the phrase 'the Wrath of God' (1<sup>18</sup>), by which, Professor Dodd maintains, Paul does not mean to describe the attitude of God to man, but rather 'to describe an inevitable process of cause and effect in a moral universe.' Especially suggestive are the sections which treat the righteousness of God in Justification (3<sup>21-4<sup>25</sup></sup>), and also the passage on Sin and Salvation in Experience (7<sup>7-26</sup>), which is viewed as 'an authentic transcript of Paul's own experience during the period which culminated in his vision on the road to Damascus' (p. 108). The commentary is the joint product of sound scholarship and of acute insight into the meaning and significance of a work which, Professor Dodd thinks, is more deeply embedded in our heritage of thought than any other single writing.

#### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

The Christian community is to-day awakening to the critical urgency of the problems and duties



associated with religious education. We cannot by any means affirm that the Church is yet wide awake, but it is in process of opening its eyes. Consequently, we are receiving a stream of books on the subject in which is reflected, with more or less clearness and fulness, the modern revolutionary insistence on the importance of the child. One of the best of these is *The Teaching Mission of the Church*, by the Rev. F. C. Taylor, M.A., B.D. (Holborn Publishing House; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Taylor's main point is that the Church is a teaching Church, and not simply a preaching and worshipping body with a side-interest in education which it commits to another body, the Sunday School. He makes this point, and then goes on to show how the modern educational standpoint affects, or should affect, the worship and the teaching in the Sunday School. He is perhaps a little too severe on the average teacher, and allows too little value to the transmissive element in education. But there is a great deal of sense in his earnest plea for better teaching and a keener sense of responsibility in the Church. A very good book.

Another book, which comes from the Abingdon Press (\$1.25), is *New Tendencies in Teaching Religion*, by Professor Harold J. Sheridan, Department of Religious Education, Ohio Wesleyan University. When we say this book is American we have already suggested that it is full of the 'Project' idea. But this idea is broken up into the 'Life-situation Approach,' the place of Activity, the emphasis on Interest, the demand for Creative Education, Systematic and Opportunistic Education. These are the titles of separate chapters, but they are all applications of the Project principle. And on each the writer has much that is true to say. The most interesting chapter, however, is the last, in which we learn some of the 'implications of the new methods.' They will demand new curricula, new text-books, new administration, a new kind of teacher, a 'graded series of experiments in social living,' a new type of building, 'laboratory guides' instead of text-books, new methods. And that, we may be forgiven for saying, is a mouthful.

The third book is the 'Swarthmore Lecture' for 1932, *Education and the Spirit of Man*, by Mr. Francis E. Pollard, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 1s. 6d. net). The Swarthmore Lecture is devoted to the exposition of the principles of the Friends. And Mr. Pollard has much to say of the relation of these principles to education. In particular, he insists that the end and aim of education are ethical, and in developing this he has done a real service to the cause of true education. The lecture is very

well worth reading for its wonderful combination of spirituality and sound sense.

A brief notice may be added of two little books of considerable importance to one section of the Sunday School, *More About the Beginners' Department*, by Miss Muriel Clover, and *Stories for Beginners*, edited by Miss Bertha C. Krall (both N.S.S.U.; 1s. net each). The former book follows Miss Barnard's 'The Beginners' Department,' and deals fully and helpfully with the characteristics of the Beginner, *i.e.* the child who is too young for the 'Primary,' with the worship and teaching of the beginner, and with all a teacher should know about him. The latter book is a selection of stories suitable for the beginner. More and more attention is being paid to these early years by educationists, and the Sunday School Union has already published a number of guiding volumes for teachers of this department. The two before us are admirable in every way.

#### THE CHRISTIAN WAY.

*The Elements of the Spiritual Life*, by Father F. P. Harton (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net), is a study in Ascetical Theology. In the Introduction, Bishop Carpenter-Garnier, of Colombo, commends the book to theological students preparing for ordination; to the younger clergy entering upon their ministry; and indeed to all priests, of whatever age, who are called upon to deal with individual souls. Nor should this 'Handbook of the Christian Way' be neglected by those of the Anglican laity who are eager to press forward in the spiritual life.

Father Harton is Warden of the Sisters of Charity, Knowle, Bristol. In these pages he gives us a sketch of the normal ways and methods by which spiritual growth may be achieved, but reminding us ever and again that our strongest motive in seeking to advance on the Christian Way must be desire for God Himself and for the furtherance of His Kingdom.

The book is divided into five parts. Part I. treats of the Christian life as the life which has the indwelling of the Holy Spirit for its root and habitual or sanctifying grace for its fruit. The three Theological Virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity are expounded as the first-fruits of the entrance of Divine supernatural grace into the soul; as also the Cardinal Virtues as gifts of God 'infused' on the natural plane, and, therefore, not specifically Christian, but broadly human.

Part II. treats of sin, temptation, repentance, and mortification. Very characteristic are the

two chapters on mortification, which does not simply connote a masochistic tendency nor is concerned wholly with austerities, but is the means of attaining to the self-discipline essential to one who would be the instrument of the Holy Spirit.

Part III. treats briefly of the seven Sacraments. Part IV. is concerned with the life of Prayer. Here the ordinary Protestant reader may be initiated into the distinction between the Ignatian method in meditation and the Sulpician method. Both methods appear to be formal and rigid, but Father Harton claims that they are so only on paper, at least after initial difficulties have been overcome. In the Sulpician method the meditation consists of three very simple and sustained acts: adoration (Jesus before the eyes); communion (Jesus in the heart); co-operation (Jesus in the hands).

In Part V. the end of the spiritual life is considered, and the ways by which that end may be reached. The end is perfection, and nothing less; and the call to perfection is characteristic of the best and truest strains of Catholicism and Evangelicalism alike. But perfection is only perfectly attainable in heaven, although the Christian life on earth is a foretaste of and preparation for it. The concluding chapter of a book which is to be commended alike for its simplicity and its devoutness considers the qualities of the ideal director of souls.

#### CHURCH AND STATE.

*Establishment in England*, by Sir Lewis Dibdin, D.C.L., Dean of the Arches (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), is a collection of eight essays, old and new, on Church and State. Six of the essays have already appeared in print, the remaining two entitled 'The Present Outlook' and 'The Present Relations of Church and State in England' appear now for the first time. The essay on 'The Relation of Church and State in English History' formed part of the Report (published 1916) of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State, and was written by Mr. A. L. Smith (the late Master of Balliol College) and Sir Lewis Dibdin. The essays, 'A Christian State,' 'The Christian Prince,' 'The Church Assembly and Parliament,' 'Established,' 'On the Report (1883) of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Orders,' are all from the hand of Sir Lewis Dibdin.

The question of an Established Church in England has been revived with the refusal of the House of Commons to approve the Measures adopting the

Prayer Books of 1927 and 1928. But it has been revived with a difference. Whereas fifty years ago Disestablishment was demanded from outside, the recent demand is from the inside. It is only languidly that the great Nonconformist bodies are now claiming it, but Anglo-Catholics and others within the Church of England are claiming it now with insistency. These learned papers serve to give the question of Establishment—a question of as great complexity as importance—its setting and place in the history of the Church of England, and should facilitate the judgment as to whether it will be possible or desirable to maintain in England a national recognition of the Christian religion.

Sir Lewis Dibdin regrets the two decisions of the House of Commons on the Prayer Book Measures. He voted throughout for the new Prayer Book in the Church Assembly, and he profoundly wishes that the House of Commons in 1927 and 1928 had imitated their predecessors in 1662, and had said that although they had a right to consider the details of the Book, they elected to abstain from doing so. On the other hand, he regards as bad advisers those who invite the Bishops, notwithstanding the House of Commons, to allow the Deposited Book, by abstaining from prosecuting offenders against the existing law.

#### A FILIAL BIOGRAPHY.

*A Memoir of Sir George Otto Trevelyan*, the distinguished author of the life of his uncle, Lord Macaulay, has been written by his son, Mr. George Macaulay Trevelyan (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net). The Trevelyans are a very old family, members of which in past generations have done the State good service. Here we have father and son both members of that very limited company the Order of Merit—the only instances of the kind hitherto—and both of them distinguished by their work in History and Biography. To George Trevelyan, as to his uncle Macaulay, evangelicalism was 'the family religion'; but we are told here that Macaulay never put on record his ultimate convictions on religion, and that from boyhood to old age Trevelyan 'treated religion respectfully but shyly.' 'In a purely negative sense he was a hearty Protestant, though he abhorred intolerance in that or any other cause.' Trevelyan was a brilliant student, first at Harrow and afterwards at Trinity College, Cambridge. He gave promise of gaining distinction as a poet, but this faculty absolutely left him in later life. He entered the House of Commons as a young man, and by his



ability won office in the Government and the Cabinet. His chief service as a politician was his championship during several years of the unfranchised citizens in the counties. It is as a man of letters, however, that Sir George Trevelyan has made a notable and abiding reputation. His 'Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay,' published in March 1876, 'has been very generally regarded as the model of that particular type of biography.' Carlyle wrote of it: 'I have nowhere found in any biography, not even in "Boswell's Johnson," a human life and character more clearly, credibly, and completely brought home to the conception of every intelligent reader; . . . making your Uncle a miracle to his own generation and memorable, were it only as a bit of psychology, to many generations that are coming.' John Morley amused its author by writing that 'the "Life of Macaulay" was a better book than the History of England.' But its author was to write a still better book in his 'Early History of Charles James Fox,' published in 1880. His son describes it as 'a work of historical art that has the effect of giving the reader the *entrée* as an intimate member of a bygone aristocratic society, which my father understood by tradition and sympathy better perhaps than any man of his time, certainly better than any man ever will again. . . . There is no other book quite of its kind, however that kind be rated.' It has ever since been regretted that that work of biography was not completed. It was followed by the far more elaborate 'History of the American Revolution,' which, we are told, has failed to become permanently popular here, though it has had a great effect in the United States. But in this History one of the characteristic features is its striking portrait studies of individuals, notably George the Third, Benjamin Franklin, Washington, and many others. George Trevelyan had his love story in which the mutual devotion of hero and heroine had its fitting reward. They were fated to live and to love to a good old age. This biography may well take a place in the order of merit.

### THE PARSON'S JOB AGAIN.

Recently two good books on the work of a Christian minister were reviewed in these columns. Here are two others, just as good, indeed better. One is from Scotland, the home of good preaching, the other from America. *The Preacher's Life and Work*, by the Rev. Lauchlan Maclean Watt, D.D., Glasgow Cathedral (Allenson; 7s. 6d. net), contains

the 'Warrack Lectures' on preaching, and the 'McNeill-Fraser Lectures' on general ministerial work. Before reading this book we should have said that the Warrack Lectureship had about exhausted its usefulness, and we should have been wrong. The book is a joy to read, because Dr. Watt gets right home every time, and his points are illustrated by the most amusing personal experiences (see 'Entre Nous' for some of them). Dr. Watt goes over the whole ground again—sermon preparation, sermon delivery, visiting, ministerial training, and the rest—and there is no weariness for the reviewer (who mistakenly thinks he knows all that is going to be said about these things). It is really difficult to lay the book down. What strikes one above everything else is the shrewd wisdom and practical sense, which could come only from experience interpreted by a level head.

The American book is *The Minister, the Method, and the Message: Suggestions on Preaching*, by the Rev. Harold Adye Prichard, M.A. (Oxon.), D.D., Rector of St. Mark's Church, Mt. Kisco, New York (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net). This work has many of the characteristics of the former, with less of the personal and anecdotal, but with something of the same common sense and vision. Dr. Prichard dwells on the need for conviction in preaching, but he emphasizes as much the necessity of a knowledge of the world. He is very scathing about the too-academic nature of the preacher's training. We teach candidates all about Church History and Hebrew, and leave them helpless about practical everyday things. There is a good deal in this book about habits of reading, about the use of a commonplace book, about the need of having a specialty, indeed about everything necessary to an all-round minister. It is a refreshingly direct, deeply spiritual, intensely practical, and, finally, richly suggestive book.

### AN IMPORTANT SURVEY.

In the spring of 1929 the Scottish Sunday School Union for Christian Education decided to appoint a Commission of men and women possessing special knowledge and experience to examine the curriculum and methods of religious education, and to make practical recommendations bearing particularly on the work of the Sunday School. The report of this Commission was presented to the executive in January of this year, and has been published under the title *Modern Tendencies in Religious Education* (S.S.S.U., Glasgow; 1s. net). The Chairman of the Commission was Principal Cairns, and the

membership included among others Dr. Boyd of Glasgow University, Professor J. E. McFadyen, Professor George S. Duncan, Dr. R. R. Rusk, the Rev. W. M. Wightman, the Rev. A. C. Craig, Mr. Stanley Nairne, and the Rev. F. J. Rae, besides a number of experts in Sunday School work. The actual work of the Commission was done by four separate panels, and their findings were carefully and repeatedly discussed by the whole Commission. The result is a report of very great value to all interested in the subject of religious education, and we desire to draw the attention of teachers and of all engaged in the administration of education, secular and sacred, to this important document. It is divided into four parts: (1) 'Some Problems of Religious Education,' in which the standpoint of modern educational theory is expounded and discussed in its relation to the teaching of religion. (2) 'The Aims and Methods of Religious Education,' in which we find a treatment of the practical problems that face the religious teacher. Grading, worship, the religious lesson, the place of doctrinal teaching all come under review. (3) 'A Critical Survey of Religious Education.' In this section religious education, as it actually is in Scotland, is examined. The facts in regard to home teaching, the teaching in the day schools, the teaching and worship in the Sunday School, and the influence of 'youth organizations' are brought under review. (4) The fourth section contains Practical Recommendations, and deals with The Provision of Trained Leadership, The Organization of Religious Education in the Church, The Sunday School Syllabus, and finally with a proposed Advisory Council on Christian Education. It will be apparent that the topics dealt with are of the highest importance, and as the conclusions of the inquiry into these matters have been reached by experts after prolonged consideration, the report just published furnishes material for serious consideration both by the Church and the school. We hope the report will be widely circulated and widely discussed.

#### DR. WARFIELD'S COLLECTED PAPERS.

*Perfectionism*, volume ii. (Milford; 22s. net), is the eighth to appear of the projected ten volumes which are to include the numerous articles on theological subjects contributed by the late Professor Benjamin B. Warfield to encyclopædias, reviews, and other periodicals. It may be recalled that Dr. Warfield was Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary of Princeton, New Jersey, between the years 1887 and 1921,

and that he proved a worthy successor of Dr. Charles Hodge in maintaining the Calvinistic tradition.

This volume contains five papers, three of which, 'Oberlin Perfectionism,' 'The "Higher Life" Movement,' and 'The Victorious Life,' are reprinted from the *Princeton Theological Review*; a fourth, 'John Humphrey Noyes and his "Bible Communists"' from *Bibliotheca Sacra*; and a fifth, 'The Mystical Perfectionism of Thomas Cogswell Upham,' from the *Union Seminary Review*.

Whereas the first volume (reviewed this year in our April number) dealt chiefly with Perfectionism in Germany, this second volume chiefly describes certain religious movements in America which may be comprised under Perfectionism. To all movements implying the doctrine that the Christian may attain perfection in this life, Dr. Warfield is strongly opposed. From his Augustinian standpoint he rejects them as Pelagianizing, and it matters not to him whether the movements are individualistic or socialistic in type. But the socialistic fall under the greater condemnation; and justly so, if they are typically represented by the 'Bible Communists' with their theory of sexual morality, which was nothing other than a theory of sexual promiscuity. In the nineteenth century, as in the sixteenth, and indeed as in the first, much licence was practised under the cloak of the experience of Christian salvation.

We have also received the sixth volume of the projected series. It is entitled *The Westminster Assembly and its Work* (Milford; 19s. net). It contains six papers, the first, bearing the title of the volume, being reprinted from the *Princeton Theological Review*. In the same periodical appeared the paper, 'The First Question of the Westminster Shorter Catechism.' From the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* come the papers, 'The Making of the Westminster Confession,' 'The Westminster Doctrine of Holy Scripture,' and 'The Printing of the Westminster Confession'; and from the *Presbyterian Quarterly* the paper, 'The Doctrine of Inspiration of the Westminster Divines.'

This volume is of wider appeal than the preceding, and it provides in convenient form a valuable addition to the somewhat scanty literature on the Westminster Confession accessible to the ordinary reader. Particularly instructive is Dr. Warfield's account of the actual work of the Westminster Assembly in producing the famous third chapter on the Decree of God. A good portion of a month's public labour was given to this chapter by the Assembly; and certainly much more than this



was expended on it by its Committees. Thus we have before us in the Confession no hasty draft, but the well-pondered and thoroughly adjusted expression of the living belief of the whole Assembly.

In treating of the Westminster doctrine of Scriptural Inspiration, Dr. Warfield joins issue with Dr. Briggs, who contends that the seventeenth-century divines were adherents of the modern 'liberal' doctrine of Scripture. It appears that Dr. Briggs has fallen into the 'Fallacy of Quotations,' and that the theologians who drew up the Confession believed in the verbal or plenary inspiration and the infallibility or inerrancy of Scripture. Is it not a pity, asks Dr. Warfield, that men are not content with corrupting our doctrines, but must also corrupt our history?

---

If the Kingdom of God does not come in America it will not be for want of hustle and human ingenuity. *Winning Ways for Working Churches*, by the Rev. Roy L. Smith (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), is an extraordinary production. It treats of all the departments of church life, and each chapter is mainly composed of some scores of suggestions (there are about a thousand in all) indicating all manner of plans and expedients which have been tried or may be tried to secure success. This is comprehensively known as salesmanship, or, as the idiom is, 'selling the people on the Church.' The variety of these suggestions, their ingeniousness and occasional sensationalism are amazing. Services are held with spot light, search light, coloured light, candle light, moon light, and no light at all. 'Minute men' are continually in evidence giving information on all possible subjects. No event in life, from the cradle to the golden wedding, is allowed to pass unnoticed. Publicity is studiously cultivated. When John Smith does anything with his right hand, not only his left hand, but the whole community, knows about it—for a notice-board announces: 'This church is proud of John Smith, because—' Of ways of advertising there is no end. A label is tied to your car telling you to park next Sunday at the Old Stone Church; beside your plate in the restaurant there is laid an invitation to attend; your barber hands you a card on Saturday informing you that now you are clean shaven and ready to attend; and finally, in self-defence, you put a bill in your window announcing that you mean to attend. The whole is most interesting, for the light it throws upon the everyday life of American churches, and it must be

cordially admitted that, amid much that is strange to the quieter taste of British churches, there are many hints and methods of great practical value.

---

*History of the English Hymn*, by Professor Benjamin Brawley (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), is a very pleasant and readable survey of the whole field of English hymnody. Besides giving a general account of the various schools and tendencies, it contains a very large number of short biographical notes on individual hymn writers, with examples of their work. Perhaps it was hardly necessary to increase the bulk of the book by printing in full the text of many of the most familiar hymns, which are to be found in all the hymn-books. A very considerable part of the work is devoted to the influence of the missionary and evangelistic movements on the writing of hymns, and particularly to modern American hymnody, which may have been somewhat overlooked in previous histories.

---

*The Atonement in Experience*, a critical study by Mr. Leon Arpee (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), is an attempt to interpret the Atonement psychologically. The point of view is very decidedly 'orthodox.' Mr. Arpee, for example, insists not only that God reconciles the sinner to Himself, but that He is reconciled to the sinner. He uses such a phrase as 'God made Himself forgiving (in the Cross) by asserting His own righteousness.' There will be small agreement with such extreme (and, to many, unscriptural) language. But there is a great deal that is rewarding in all this study, much that is freshly put; and, as a whole, the treatment is intelligently and spiritually helpful. The most suggestive chapter is that in which the writer insists that the key to the whole problem lies in this, that the Atonement is an act of God *entirely*, and not in any way of the God-man. It is always good to find some one facing up to a great Christian fact and looking at it reverently and intelligently. And that is what we find here.

---

*Schopenhauer, his Life and Philosophy*, by Miss Helen Zimmern (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is a completely revised edition of a work originally published in 1876. It is a frank portrait of a very disagreeable man. The fact that there was insanity in his heredity is a palliation of his weaknesses, but they were unpleasant all the same. He was conceited, dogmatic, egotistical to an absurd degree, abusive, and difficult to live with. His mother had the poorest opinion of him. He had no friends, and considered this a sign of his worth.

His pessimism was an early development and was a part of the man. Miss Zimmern gives an excellent account of Schopenhauer's philosophy and his relation to other thinkers, dwelling especially on the influence on him of Indian thought. This is an interesting book for any one who wishes a true and vivid picture of the man and the philosopher.

*Alexandrine Teaching on the Universe* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), by the Rev. R. B. Tollinton, D.D., D.Litt., is composed of four Lectures delivered at Newnham College, Cambridge, as part of the scheme of the Vacation Term for Biblical Study. The writer, who is well versed in his subject, selects from the 'Alexandrines' (whose standpoint was in the main eclectic, Platonic, and abstract) the four great teachers, Philo, Clement, Origen, and Plotinus, and presents their views and those of the Gnostics on the Transcendence of God, Mediation, the Universe, and Man. He also compares and contrasts their views with certain phases of modern scientific opinion. Although the author has given no references, his book must not be lightly passed over by the student. It appears to present a reliable and well-balanced exposition, is written in a clear and interesting fashion, and reflects wide reading not only among the 'Alexandrines' but also among recent writers in philosophy and science.

One of the practical needs of the student of the New Testament has been a reliable 'synopticon,' a graphic representation of the synoptic structure, showing the inter-relations of the three Gospels. This has now, for the first time in English, been provided in *Synoptic Tables*, by Mr. Joseph Smith, Lecturer in Old Testament and in Biblical and Classical Languages, Overdale College, Selly Oak (Berean Press, Birmingham; 2s. net in paper, and 3s. net in cloth). Mr. Smith, whose death last year was a great loss to scholarship, was a man of wide learning, and this work was the cherished result of long and fruitful study. It is based on the 'Synoptische Tafeln' of Johannes Weiss, but is largely an independent work. It is beautifully simple, and yet elaborately complete, and enables the student to see at a glance the way in which the first three Gospels grew, or, if not at a glance, at least with comparatively little effort. The book has won emphatic appreciation from scholars like Dr. Vernon Bartlet, Dr. Sydney Cave, and Dr. Wheeler Robinson, and should be in the hands of all serious teachers of the Bible.

12s. 6d. net), Dr. T. R. Glover collects a number of papers written, as he says in an engaging Dedication, for people bred on the Classics, and fond of them. The first paper, 'The Greek on the Sea,' was read to Hellenic Travellers, as also the last on 'The Vitality of Greece'; otherwise we have found no definite indication that the papers have already received publicity.

The fare here provided by the learned author is rich and varied and, as we should expect, well-spiced. Having sampled it all, and found it to our relish, we commend it to the reader of these pages, but warn him that it contains some novel and unaccustomed dishes. Should he be averse to ventures in diet, we should advise him to restrict himself—to begin with—to 'The Boy and the Theorist,' 'The Manners of a Gentleman,' 'Foreign Gods,' and 'The Dæmon Environment.'

The first item shows that it is still possible to discuss education, even Greek education, without being tedious; the second, that manners rest upon principle, upon a philosophy of life, in the modern as in the ancient world; the third, that it is no use complaining about foreign gods ('the canon of Celsus will not do, and Mr. Gandhi cannot have India to himself'); and the fourth, that the belief in dæmons did not yield to the attack of philosophy or science, that it held its own among the early Christians, but that it faded away at last before the ideas and the personality of Jesus of Nazareth.

But there are many other items on this bill of fare containing something of interest to the student of religion and morals. Let him turn, for example, to 'The Wandering Greek' and he will find a note on the influence of the wanderer in modifying religious outlooks, in opening the way for the syncretism of the Roman Empire, and in propagating the Christian religion.

'Multum in Parvo' is a phrase certainly applicable to the little book on *St. Paul's Life and Letters*, by Professor A. C. Baird, D.D., B.Sc., of Aberdeen University (T. & T. Clark; 1s. net). The book is the latest addition to the well-known series of 'Primers for Teachers,' which already numbers many remarkable works by recognized scholars. Among these Professor Baird holds a high place, and into this small work he has packed a vast amount of learning, well-digested and admirably set forth. Teachers will find this primer an excellent guide, and, even if they read nothing else, they would be equipped sufficiently for their task by what they would have here at their hands. Dr. Baird is able, we observe, to accept the Pastoral



Epistles as a genuine Pauline production, and this helps to make his later pages fuller and more vivid.

Professor Doremus A. Hayes, who occupies the Chair of New Testament Interpretation in the Graduate School of Theology, Evanston, Illinois, has written an interesting book, *The Resurrection Fact* (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.; \$2.00). The investigation can hardly be said to be a critical and historical study, as the texts of the record are assumed to be essentially trustworthy from the beginning. On this assumption a descriptive account is given of the New Testament narratives. Professor Hayes makes free use of his imagination. In his account of the Appearance to Peter, for example, he writes: 'There he sat with his head in his hands and tried and tried to think clearly and to see his way to some explanation of these mysteries.' He even tells us that Peter 'had no appetite and no thought of food.' The discussions one misses in these expositions are, however, well supplied in a valuable chapter entitled 'Difficulties to Faith in the Resurrection.' Professor Hayes firmly believes in the historical fact of the Empty Tomb, and very effectively works out the theory that Jesus appeared to His disciples in different guises, now bearing the print of the nails, now 'in glorious transfiguration of light as on the mountain top.' The book is written in a spirit of glowing conviction and in a style which rises to heights of real eloquence. Many preachers will find it useful and suggestive.

*Jesus and our Questions*, by the Rev. H. Mortimer Sinfeld (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), contains a series of addresses by one who is a confessed admirer and imitator of the Rev. Studdert Kennedy. The addresses are above everything, free and easy, humorous and colloquial. In a foreword, by the Rev. J. A. Findlay of Didsbury College, it is suggested that this is the most taking style for the audience to which they were addressed. There can be no doubt that they would keep interest awake, but one wonders whether the Christian message is best conveyed in speech interlarded with slang, and whether all this chaff about 'roamin' in the gloamin'' is likely to induce a spiritual impression. Of the preacher's earnestness and Christian fervour there can be no two opinions, and it may confidently be hoped that with increasing age and experience he will become a power.

*Through the Prayer Book* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Dyson Hague, D.D., Toronto,

may be regarded as a companion volume to the same author's 'The Story of the English Prayer Book.' In this new work he gives an exposition of the teaching and language of the Prayer Book, and explains the origins and contents of its services, with special reference to the Canadian Prayer Book. He writes from the Evangelical standpoint, but strives to be fair and impartial. He intends the book not so much for the learned student as for the average Churchman. Naturally enough, as one who served on the Revision Committee, he makes frequent reference to the Canadian Book of Common Prayer (1921), for which he claims that it is just the English Prayer Book enriched and adapted to Canadian Church life.

It is interesting to observe that the Canadian Prayer Book contains nine new services, among them being an Order of Service for Children, a Special Service for Missions, a Form of Thanksgiving for the Blessings of Harvest, also various Induction and Consecration Services. It contains also Forms of Family Prayer.

Dr. Hague's volume is well arranged and clearly written, and may be commended to all who look for a popular exposition of the Prayer Book on Evangelical lines. It is produced at a very moderate price.

In the 'Study Hour' Series, Dr. W. Graham Scroggie has issued *Psalms: Vol. II.* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), which contains an exposition of Pss 42-89. Each psalm is printed as in the Authorized Version, difference of type being used to mark emphasis and indicate refrains. A short exposition follows, ending with a key thought and some illustrative quotations. The book is in attractive form and is suitable for devotional reading.

An admirable handbook for senior classes is sent out by the National Sunday School Union—*Problems of Belief and Conduct*, volume i., edited by Mr. Godfrey S. Pain, in collaboration with Mr. E. H. Hayes (1s. 6d. net). Questions, difficulties, and problems were collected from young people themselves and form the basis of this book. The problems are concerned with the personality and miracles of Jesus, with general questions about Him (such as the Virgin Birth), and with the Bible (such posers as 'Is the Story of the Flood True?'). The problems are real problems, and they have been dealt with by Professor J. A. Findlay, the Rev. F. C. Spurr, Dr. J. C. Bacon, and the Rev. H. H. Wilson. To their contributions are added

Discussion Questions, Test Questions, and Self-teaching Questions, with notes for leaders. Altogether this is a very fine example of the best kind of 'discussion' teaching for youth of from fourteen to twenty years of age.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge renders real service to the whole Church by publishing reprints of many interesting and valuable Christian texts and documents. With the assistance of Lord Halifax and the English Church Union, it has now added to its gifts by re-publishing *The King's Book* (6s. net), issued under the authority of Henry VIII. in 1543 as 'a necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man.' The introduction is especially valuable, because it is the last contribution of Canon T. A. Lacey, who died on December 6, 1931. Canon Lacey thinks that *The King's Book* is of considerable historical interest because 'it contains the deliberate judgment passed by the Church of England on the topics treated at a time when that Church was perhaps too intensively national, but was happily released from undue subservience to one foreign influence, and not yet seriously affected by other foreign influences which were destined in the near future to acquire a mischievous domination.' Not all will agree with his claim that if it had been allowed a fair field, there might have been a happier and not more insular Church of England than the last four centuries have known. After giving a declaration of Faith, *The King's Book* treats the Articles, the Seven Sacraments, the Commandments, the Paternoster, the Ave Maria, and articles on Freewill, Justification, Good Works, and Prayer for Souls departed.

Always a land apart from the rest of the British Isles, the proud isolation of Ireland is now intensified. Consequently, it is a country about which most Britishers know relatively little. A book such as *Cathedrals of the Church of Ireland*, by the Bishops of Ossory and Killaloe (S.P.C.K. ; 6s. net), is therefore welcome, if only for the novelty of its information. It opens an unexplored field. The very dedications of the churches indicate the gulf between the two countries: for example, St. Finbar, St. Flannan, St. Canice, St. Lasarian, and St. Fethlimidh—Celtic names of the type one meets only in Cornwall, which was evangelized by the Irish missionaries.

The present volume is frankly of the nature of

a popular guide book. Each cathedral is described, its history (usually romantic) detailed, and a very brief account given of its main architectural features, and such furnishings as may be of archaeological interest. Where the building is modern, the information given is of the sort which the ordinary visitor demands. The volume is well illustrated and the photographs reveal the striking differences between the development of ecclesiastical art in Ireland and England.

Few men have done more to bridge the chasm between East and West than Dr. Kenneth Saunders, with his learning, his enthusiasm, and his catholicity of spirit. Here is another of his books, *The Heritage of Asia* (S.C.M. ; 5s. net). The idea is excellent. A short history of Asia is followed by studies of the heritages of the three great Eastern peoples—India, China, Japan (with an additional one upon Korea); of the three great Asiatics, Buddha, Confucius, and Shōtoku; of the three great Scriptures, Analects, the Gita, and the Lotus of the Good Law (though this chapter is little more than a mere note); and of the three great modern leaders, Gandhi, Hu Shih, and Kagawa. That is a fine scheme, wrought out with the author's customary knowledge and sympathy. But in places—as, for instance, in his eulogy of Gandhi—there is a disquieting lack of balance. A lawyer does not help his case by screaming. The longish list of illustrative readings (55 pp.) is hardly chosen with this scholar's usual deftness, but is helpful. And a useful little bibliography closes the book.

No one has flowers like the pictures upon the seed packets, and the eulogies of publishers upon the wrappers of new books prove often optimistic. But when Mr. Lincoln Williams claims for *The Influence of Islam* (10s. 6d. net), by the Rev. E. J. Bolus, B.D., that it is 'a profound and scholarly work,' his words are not too strong. An excellent introduction, a survey of Islam in various countries, and its varying colours in those several soils, including an informing chapter upon 'The New Turkey,' leads on to a study of the Muslim mind, learned, sympathetic, and yet balanced, and heavily documented. Muhammadan Law, Muhammadan Philosophy, Mysticism, and Ethics are each treated in full chapters, by one who has the facts at his command, and is not hustled by nor lost among them, but looks down on them and can arrange them in an orderly scheme.



## The Guidance of God.

A FURTHER STUDY OF THE OXFORD GROUP MOVEMENT.

BY THE REVEREND J. P. THORNTON-DUESBERY, CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IN an earlier article<sup>1</sup> I attempted to give some account of the doctrinal and metaphysical basis upon which the teaching of the Oxford Group on Guidance seems to rest. My present purpose is simply to set down what the Oxford Group has taught me as to the practical methods and implications of living a God-guided life. I must apologise, if full treatment of this involves any repetition of what I have already said.

This practical aspect is surely of immense importance at the present time. For now, if ever, when we do not know from day to day what fresh disorder or crisis the morning paper may reveal, we are in urgent need of that Divine wisdom of which St. James speaks. 'Human wisdom has failed. In the bewildered world of to-day men need leadership that is God-confident. We lead others: who is leading us?'<sup>2</sup>

Very often, at Committees and Councils, both 'secular' and 'religious,' I have mentally turned aside for a moment and asked myself: 'What would happen if we really sought the guidance of the Holy Spirit here? If the opening Collect at the Vestry Meeting, or the Statutory Prayers in the House of Commons were really *prayed*, not merely read or said, by all concerned?' What a saving of tempers it would mean! What a gain in vision, and insight, and sympathy! My mind turns to other gatherings (not only, of course, inside the immediate fellowship of the Oxford Group, but among Christians of many types in many lands), where the guidance of God has been sought, the Divine wisdom claimed and received, and the result has been the surmounting of seemingly impassable barriers, the winning of men and women to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ, new power to deal with social and racial problems, and the laying of sure foundations for the reunion and expansion of the Christian Church.

Is all that too visionary and impracticable? Surely, as Christians who believe in the purpose of God in the life of the world, we can be content with nothing less as our objective than the bringing

of every thought, every human plan and enterprise, into captivity under the Mind of Christ. There is, indeed, as Dr. Vernon Bartlet points out, a 'general insight progressively vouchsafed to the docile and waiting will. And that is what all serious Christians alike hold.' The trouble is that while we all hold it, so few of us even begin to take our belief seriously in practice. It raises so many issues! And that not only in the intellectual sphere, where the problems are indeed of great significance, but also in all the new reaches of surrender and discipline which must be attempted if a truly God-guided life is to be attained. It is idle to talk of the guidance of God as controller of Parliament or Municipality or College or Parish, unless we have first recognized it as supreme in our families and homes. And it is idle, too, to attempt to lead family and home beneath that guidance, unless we have first yielded ourselves to it in our personal lives.

Here, in fact, as elsewhere in its teaching, the Oxford Group is not proclaiming any 'new doctrine'; if it were, if it even claimed to be, many of us would be chary of identifying ourselves with it. But the leading of the Holy Spirit was promised by Christ and experienced by His followers in the Apostolic Age and ever since, and this 'general insight progressively vouchsafed' attains meaning and value for the individual only as it is translated (and all this is the work of the Spirit) into their own *particular* needs and circumstances. Of course, a strong, balanced Christian life requires for foundations a grasp of general principle, all that is 'implicit in Christ's own moral personality and His teaching.'<sup>3</sup> But the Christian is promised even more than this; 'when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say.'<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Vernon Bartlet, *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, April 1932.

<sup>4</sup> Lk 12<sup>12</sup>. Several versions of this promise are preserved; cf. Lk 21<sup>14-15</sup>, Mk 13<sup>11</sup>, Mt 10<sup>19-20</sup>. In the last-named passage the words *δοθήσεται ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσετε* are omitted by Origen and by the so-called 'Western' authorities. But this is probably due to *homoeoteleuton*; cf. Souter's critical note, *ad loc.*

<sup>1</sup> *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, March 1932.

<sup>2</sup> From the invitation to a recent 'House Party' of the Oxford Group.

That is a clear promise of particular, contingent guidance in certain definite circumstances. And the story of Christianity shows that it has been fulfilled—not only in the law-court, but wherever the Christian ‘witness,’ seeking to bring another to his Master, has prayed swiftly and silently ‘Lord, show me what to do next.’ For guidance (and this cannot be said too emphatically) comes in action; it is not given for enjoyment, but for use. Our tragedy, our impotence, is this: We hold it all in theory, but we do not practise what we hold.

It will be well at this stage to emphasize another important consideration—the *normality* of the God-guided life. It is, of course, true (as the Barthians remind us) that Divine guidance is always supernatural, always a miracle of grace, the breaking-in of God upon men. But it would be unfortunate if attention was focused exclusively upon the strange and startling, however clear we may be that any particular instance is more than ‘mere coincidence.’ In the long run judgment must depend upon the fruits of character in those who are seeking to live as God guides. But character is formed far more through constant discipline in ‘small’ things than through heroic action at great crises; indeed, the latter depends upon the former. And it is exactly for this reason that obedience in detail is so important—exactly here, too, that we so often fail and are content to muddle through with the second-best.

The impact of Divine guidance may, in fact, be recognized and distinguished from mere coincidence precisely by the moral issue which it always raises, whether this is of obviously ‘great’ importance or not. This is where the imagination needs to be quickened; ‘the daily round, the common task’ are usually exacting rather than exciting; and so they very readily become mere matters of routine, and are carried out with no real reference to the Will of God and no appreciation of their possibilities.

Perhaps a personal illustration may be permitted to make this plain. In an ordinary Oxford term I normally see about fifteen pupils for an hour a week each, for eight weeks. These ‘tutorials’ are at fixed times on fixed days, arranged (after personal prayer for direction about it) at the beginning of term. By the sixth week the rush of term has had its effect; both they and I are getting tired; and the tutorial very easily becomes just an hour of duty to be got through. But when this happens ‘the spring has gone out of the year’; however good the intellectual instruction may happen to be, something is lacking. For the tutor is concerned not only with the scholastic successes

of his pupils, but with their whole equipment, mental, physical, and spiritual, for life; and the moment he loses an imaginative sympathy with them as men and women, he ceases to be able to meet their personal needs. Good mass-production of machine-made scholars may continue, but that is not the full work of the Spirit of God. I find myself in increasing need of Divine guidance to do my daily work.

It is, then, in all these daily matters of ordinary life that we so greatly need the clear light, the widened range of vision that Guidance means. How is it to be found and recognized?

I was blocking out this article when I received a letter from an Australian reader of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in Adelaide. ‘You mention in your article,’ he wrote, ‘the period of Silence and waiting in the morning. Is there more detail you could add as to what to do during that period?’ In that question he went to the very heart of the matter, for in Christian living the root is ever and always communion with God, while guidance is one of the fruits that grace its branches. If we are to enjoy as a constant experience that illumination which turns the dull, leaden tones of life to sunny gold and sends us out to do in God and for God not only the good, but the best—then the first essential is decisive surrender to His Will, the human side of that work of Atonement which He wrought once for all in the Cross of Christ. Without that start, further progress is illusory. No amount of discipline, no amount of living in accordance with principle, can ever be a substitute for a personal experience of Christ Crucified.

But the communion with God thus established must be maintained, and this involves the giving of time and the taking of trouble. A single introduction does not make a friendship; if a man is to enter into the fulness of that relationship with God, he must meet Him often at God’s House and in his own and in the houses of their mutual friends. A God-guided life is the fruit of Sacrament and Public Worship, of co-operation in Christian fellowship and endeavour, of time set apart daily for quiet meeting with God.

This personal ‘Quiet Time’ should be flexible, not bound by any rigid rules—except the rule of making sure that no day passes without such communion with God. Most people find in practice that it is best kept in the early morning, before the rush of the day has begun, and it is surprising how many who previously thought it impossible to find opportunity for it before going off to business or beginning household duties find in experience that



its value far outweighs the discipline involved in keeping it. During a campaign in a South London parish last year when we were talking with an informal group of men, some one said that he could never find time for such a 'morning watch.' At once half a dozen business men got up one after the other and told how what had once seemed impossible to them was now a daily practice which they would not dream of missing.

How the time is spent will vary as between individuals, and from time to time in any one individual's practice. But the essential elements in it seem to be (1) the reading of the Bible, preferably according to some plan; (2) vocal prayer—confession, supplication, intercession, thanksgiving, worship; (3) a time of silent waiting upon God.

'In the silence,' says Miss Eleanor Forde,<sup>1</sup> 'we are led into God's secret plans as far as He wishes us to know them at the time. We will be reminded of letters to write, people to see, and things to do. As with Philip, Peter, and Ananias, the summons comes with a stamp of divine urgency upon it when we are trying to win others to Christ. *Guidance comes in action.* If your life is caught up in God's purpose to redeem the world, it may matter seriously what street you take, which train you go by, and what time you make an appointment. God's Will is a mosaic. The thought may come that there is some new line of personal discipline to be taken up, a relationship to be put right. Promises are given which later we have the joy of seeing come true. There will be, if one's ear is sensitive, warnings that temptation is about, and, like Noah, we may be "warned of God of things not seen as yet." Encouragement is constant.

'It has been a habit with many people to keep a small notebook for recording these thoughts. There is, of course, no virtue in this *per se*, but hear Martin Luther on this point, in a letter to Master Peter the Barber in 1535:

"It so happens quite often that in contemplating on a part (of the Lord's Prayer) or one of the petitions, I come into such rich thoughts that I let all the other (petitions) alone. And when such rich and good thoughts come one ought to stop all other prayers and make room for such thoughts, listening quietly and hindering them by no means. For then it is the Holy Ghost Himself who preaches. And one word of His is better than a thousand of our Prayers. And thus I have often learned

more from one prayer than I might have learned by much reading and meditating . . .

"And as I have said before about the Lord's Prayer I say again: In case the Holy Spirit should come among such thoughts and should begin to preach into your heart with rich and illuminating thoughts, then do homage to Him and let your own thoughts behind. Be still and listen to Him who knows better than you. And keep in mind what He preaches and write it down. Then you will experience miracles."

The Rev. Howard Rose in his pamphlet on *The Quiet Time*, based on experience in the Oxford Group, tabulates the results of God's guidance thus:

'Thoughts are given by way of:

1. Warnings: (a) Personal. (Wrong motives, thoughts, actions, etc., are revealed which might become an occasion of sin.)  
(b) Concerning others. (Insight is given into the difficulties of those one is trying to help.)
2. Some action to be taken, instruction *re* plans, etc.
3. Letters to write.
4. Visits to pay.
5. Thoughts to share with others.
6. Instructions *re* prayer, praise, what to read, etc.
7. Miscellaneous thoughts and promises.

N.B.—The more general results of the Quiet Time are:

(i) A first-hand experience of God through Christ, the Bible, prayer, and the listening for the voice of the Holy Spirit.

(ii) A Christ-centred and unified life, issuing in joyous, spontaneous, God-directed service.'

Naturally, such terms of silence need not be confined to the early morning; many people 'come apart' for a few minutes more than once in the course of the day, and go back with vision renewed to their work.

Nor, of course, is guidance given only through Attentive Prayer. I quote again from Mr. Rose:

'Experience shows that the individual is guided by God, both during the quiet time and throughout the day, in the following ways:

1. Through the Holy Spirit in Attentive Prayer

<sup>1</sup> *The Guidance of God*, pp. 25 ff.

(i.e. the unhurried, quiet time waiting upon God), by means of:

- (a) The Scriptures.
- (b) The Conscience.
- (c) Luminous Thoughts.
- (d) Cultivating the Mind of Christ.

2. Through reading the Bible and Prayer.

3. Through Circumstances.

4. Through Reason.

5. Through Church, Group, or Fellowship.'

What is of supreme importance is that the individual should believe with all his heart that God does guide, and should be ready and sensitive to receive the guidance, however it comes.

## The Barthian School.

### III.

#### Friedrich Gogarten.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN M'CONNACHIE, D.D., DUNDEE.

#### II.

##### AS THEOLOGIAN AND ETHICAL TEACHER.

GOGARTEN is quite clear that one cannot rest on any past theology. Theology is only living when it stands in conflict with present errors and temptations, not with errors outside the Church, such as materialism or Marxism—that is the business of apologetics—but with errors inside the Church, which hinder the Word of God from reaching us.<sup>1</sup>

His criticism, therefore, of modern thought, at which we have looked, constitutes his starting-point for a new and truer theology. So far he has made no effort to offer a complete theology; indeed, he declares that he is not in a position to do so. He writes rather as one who has gone astray, and who is slowly and painfully making his way back. He emphasizes continually, like Barth, that his work is 'only the very first beginning of what I can only hope will be carried forward better by me or others.' But he regards theology as the pressing task of the present.

As to his own theology, he lays down, for himself, certain leading principles. The first is that the nature of theology is determined by the gospel and by the present. Theological work is not free creation, but obedience, service of the Word. One can only deal with theology as a responsible believer in the gospel, and with a care for the truth of the gospel. When one does not do that, one does not

deal with theology, but with the science of religion.<sup>2</sup> Here is a question which concerns the existence of the Church to-day. If anywhere it is threatened in its deepest part, it is in this confusion of theology with the science of religion. Again, theology must be objective. He points out that what distinguishes the Apostles' Creed from every modern religious production is its realism of expression. One cannot think of anything less sentimental, or more free from subjectivity. Again, theology must be produced in intimate relation with the Church. As faith receives its reality only inside the Church, so theology receives there also its clearly defined task. With the other theologians of this movement Gogarten takes his starting-point from the gospel as preached in the Church. In consequence, his mind is much taken up with the place and need of the Confessions through which the Church witnesses her faith, for only as a confession to God can the Church express her faith. 'There is no Church without theology, and without a confession.'<sup>3</sup> Again, theology must be dialectical. That is, it must stand as the publican, afar off from God, in awe and fear, seeing Him only brokenly, one aspect at a time, as in a glass darkly. He is the high and holy One before whom man acknowledges himself a sinner. The presupposition of Gogarten's whole work is that the all-important question which exists for man is the question of God.

<sup>2</sup> *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1930, pp. 115-119.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, 353-374.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Schuld der Kirche*, 15.



(1) *God the Creator*.<sup>1</sup>—He begins from the position that the Christian Faith, in the first instance, is faith in God, the Creator. There can be no right understanding of God as Redeemer apart from the faith in God as Creator; just as little as there can be a right idea of God as Creator, apart from the faith in God as Redeemer. 'God the Creator Who reveals Himself in the Word of Jesus is not a distant and future God, but a near and present God, and as this near and present God, He is the God Who forgives sins, that is, the Redeeming God.'<sup>2</sup> As Creator and Redeemer, He is the Father. The Fatherhood of God is not to Gogarten a common religious truth made known to all time, of which Jesus is the symbol, and witness. It is a truth of Revelation (Mt 11<sup>27</sup>). God is the Father in Himself, Father of His only begotten Son, whose Word in Redemption is a renewal of His claim in Creation.

This thought of God as Creator is central to Gogarten's whole theological and ethical outlook. Because recent theology has neglected this truth, and surrendered to the idea of the free personality, it has lost the true idea of the faith in redemption. For, looked at from the point of view of God the Creator, man is never a free personality, but is always bound in responsibility to another. He is bound to God because God is his Creator, and he is only to be understood as one who from the beginning is called into being by the Creative Will to be what he is through another. This faith in God the Creator disturbs the faith in the free creative Ego as the middle point of the world, and sets God again in the centre as 'The Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.'

(2) *God and Man*.—With all the members of this school, Gogarten emphasizes strongly the separation between God and man. His greatest concern, he says, has been lest the new theology should plunge into the gloomy grave of all ruling theologies—identity between God and man.<sup>3</sup> But he is always careful to make clear that the radical separation between God and man is the separation of sin, and no other.<sup>4</sup> God is the Utterly and Entirely Other—in that much misunderstood phrase—but not in Himself. It is man who has made Him the Other by his sin. Sin is so radical in man, through his falling away from God, that he has set himself in absolute opposition to God. The carnal mind is enmity against God. 'The radical opposition of God and man in this theology,' he says, 'is no other than the expression for the fact that so long as we

live in time we have to do with sin. We shall not be freed from it in the sense that we can put it away, as one puts away a garment. We shall be freed from it only through forgiveness, only through God, and ever again through forgiveness.'<sup>5</sup>

The frequent criticism of this movement that it introduces a metaphysical dualism, and tears God and man apart in hopeless separation, rests on a misapprehension. It is not a hopeless separation, but the only hope is in the gospel. God and man can only meet in grace.

(3) *The Word of God*.—In this recognition of the gulf between God and man, due to sin, theology again recovers its task as a concern for the Word of God through which God bridges the chasm caused by sin. For revelation can only reach us in a Word of God, a communication from the other side. There can be no immediacy of contact with the Deity. There can only be a hearing of His Word, which is the one form of communication between a 'Thou' and an 'I.'

Gogarten gives much care to answer the question, 'what is the Word of God?'<sup>6</sup> It is no parable, no symbol, it is nothing other than a Word of God which is spoken to us that we may obey it. It is the Word which God in His boundless compassion has spoken into the world of sin in Jesus Christ. That there is a Word of God, is a sign that He does not separate Himself from the world, but that He acknowledges the whole world as His. If we ask Gogarten where he finds the Word of God, he answers, 'only and alone in the Word of the Bible, preached in the Church.' He quotes with approval Luther's teaching that 'the whole content of the Word of God is the law and the gospel.'<sup>7</sup> But he is less concerned with the actual content of the Word of God than with its relation to man. He does not trouble about the Being and Nature of God. He concerns himself with man, with man as determined through God and the world. He will make clear to us the concrete situation in which man hears the Word of God. He will give again to the Word its character as *Word* spoken to man. He will shut off all ways through which it is made the expression merely of a common religious truth, or a personal experience. This Word of God, which is inseparably the Word of grace and of judgment, is free and remains free, sovereign and remains sovereign. It gives itself to no party or Church to possess. The Church is not the keeper but the servant of the Word of God, which remains in

<sup>1</sup> *Ich glaube* . . . , 43-63.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, . . . , 157.

<sup>3</sup> *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1924, Heft 7, p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, 1925, Heft 1, p. 77.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.*, 1925, Heft 1, p. 66.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.*, 1927, Heft 4, p. 330.

<sup>7</sup> *Glaube und Wirklichkeit*, 126.

every case under the lordship of God. It is a Word which is never spoken to us except in human speech, and it reaches us only out of the lips of another. A man cannot hear or receive the Word of God in lonely contemplation, or in the withdrawal of his own soul.<sup>1</sup> It comes to us only out of the lips of the preacher who has himself heard it, or of our neighbour who lays God's claim for obedience upon us. Thus the Word of God is spoken from man to man, and when it is spoken and heard, the hearer is responsible with his whole being to the claim of the other.

Much of Gogarten's thought is occupied with his concern for the Word of God. To rescue it from the relativity of the modern religious attitude, to recover it as Revelation, to separate it from all attempts of men to bring it within the ambit of their self-activity, to define it in its various relations, is the task to which he has supremely set himself. It is his richest contribution. Most important of all is his working out of the category of Revelation in its various connexions and relations, and, first of all, in its relation to religion.

(a) Revelation and Religion.<sup>2</sup> Of all the pretensions of men, religion is the most tremendous; for it is the claim to be able to attain from the finite to the infinite, and with the powers of the finite. It is the attempt to bridge the absolute opposition of Creator and creature. No more powerful work has man created than the world religions, none with more passion, and such ambitious goals. It has also proved the most fateful and ambiguous creation of man, for it has placed religion where nothing else should stand, between God and man. This movement from man to God is ever again attempted, with the passion of longing, but it never has succeeded. In all their varied forms the religions have one thing in common. They all come from this side of things. They represent man's approach to God by human means.

Revelation, on the other hand, comes from the other side. It is God's approach to man. But is not revelation a part of religion? Does not religion base the right of its being on revelation? That to Gogarten is deep and dangerous error. Revelation is only possible where the impossible happens, where God enters into finite form, and takes limited appearance in this limited world. When this impossible actually happens, the event is Revelation. But then it is no more religion. This event has become visible in history in the man Jesus of Nazareth, the Word made flesh, which means the

end of all that is human, of all human virtue and religion, and an absolute new beginning. Between the human that is ending, and the new that is beginning, there is no transition or development. There is only a hiatus—death—the Cross, and the New Birth.<sup>3</sup> There begins another than our human activity—there begins God's creative activity, God's Eternal Yes, spoken from eternity, a Word spoken to us. Not only is God the Absolute Other, but the divine activity is also, over against all other activity, the Absolute Other.

(b) Revelation and Mysticism.<sup>4</sup> Revelation equally stands opposed to Mysticism. Mysticism (*Mystik*), as Gogarten understands the word, in the more specific German sense, is the effort to find a way to God through inner experience, without mediation. It is therefore another form of religion, another attempt to build a bridge from this side to God, with all the possible self-deception of religion. As such it is opposed to Revelation. Revelation implies an objective historical fact. Whereas mysticism is indifferent to history. For if one believes that the actual nature of piety resides in an immediate experience of God, then one makes of the historical facts of the faith a symbol for a super-historical, timeless event in the soul; and with that, history ceases to have any meaning as an event that takes place in time.

The mystical experience is something which religion creates by its own work, its own means. What it achieves is a work of man, a special condition of soul, a condition which comes and goes, and must ever again be created. In his last and highest experience man stands throughout on the basis of religion, that is, on human ground. He remains within the experience of his own soul, and there is no reason to perceive why one should come nearer to God on the mystical heights, than another man who knows nothing of the mystical experience. In relation to God—the Absolute Other, the Absolute Question to which we can give no answer—the relative differences between the two are of no account. Gogarten, therefore, rejects mysticism as a way from within to God, because it ends at last, not in God, but in the Ego. The true Christian faith is not the mystic divine experience of the Ego, but the humility before the demands of the personal God, as revealed in the Word made flesh.

(c) Revelation and Time.<sup>5</sup> In order to explain the Incarnation, the Revelation of God in the Christ of history, Gogarten introduces his particular conception of time and eternity, which can only be

<sup>1</sup> *Glaube und Wirklichkeit*, 137.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Religiöse Entscheidung*, 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, 64.

<sup>4</sup> *Von Glauben und Offenbarung*, 27.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.*, 54.



indicated in a word. He is at pains to show that time and eternity do not constitute an opposition in God's nature. He, the All-powerful, holds time and eternity together. Eternity and time are not to be regarded as two worlds, or two magnitudes, over against each other. Time has no other origin, and no other goal, than eternity. Time may become eternity, and yet remain time. Eternity may become time, and yet remain eternity. Eternity is time filled and completed. Time is eternity limited and impoverished. When God became man, eternity became time. It flooded into time, in the years A.D. 1-30, in the historical person of Jesus, and became the *pleroma*, the fulness of the time. Yet God did not cease to be Divine and Eternal. This world, according to Gogarten, is the place where time and eternity conflict, or rather, it is itself the conflict of time and eternity, a conflict that finds expression in every human heart.

(d) Revelation and Civilization.<sup>1</sup> He defines revelation also in its relation to culture or civilization. By culture he means the special mastery of the world, and of life, which man achieves by his own powers. It is the work into which man puts the noblest of his powers of body, mind, and spirit. It is the work of the whole man, not a work, but the work of man, the fulfilment and completion of man. But the disturbing question is, 'What has man attained thereby?' The answer can only be that the world is come to an end of its wisdom. Even religion, whose help has been called in to save civilization, has failed. Gogarten summons us, not to forsake the work of civilization, but to forsake the madness of self-realization, and go back to the place where the gospel of Christ is preached, which tells how the people which walked in darkness saw a great light. Here we read of a new birth, a new creation, a new life. Here we read of a man being given back his original purity. Here we know the wonder of forgiveness. What happens here, happens beyond man's knowledge or experience.

(e) Revelation and Authority.<sup>2</sup> The question of authority, in relation to revelation, also occupies Gogarten's mind. It is admitted that every authority which is not a divine authority carries in it the seeds of decay. But man to-day claims to carry this divine authority in himself, in his own nature, a nature of the highest autonomy, in his conscience, which makes all outside authority for him simply superfluous. The moral creative man is authority and law to himself. The result of this claim is that to-day we have no authority

at all, at least none that is worth the name. For when this dream of the divine in man is dreamed, the opposition to the divine ordinances of society is the necessary consequence. These ordinances are for the sake of the imperfections of man, as the border-lines which he is to acknowledge, but not cross. But divine man need no longer acknowledge them.

But suppose that no divine quality, no creative autonomy, lies at the foundation of man's nature, but an enslaved will; suppose that conscience is not the pure voice of God, but is entangled in guilt, what then? Then only a declaration of the Will of God can constitute an authority. For only where God declares His will, and lets His judgment fall, is authority. This declaration of God's will and judgment is real and present, says Gogarten, in the Word of God, in the Scriptures, and supremely in the Word made flesh. We discover here the reason why Gogarten lays such emphasis on the Word of God in the Bible, as the supreme authority.

(f) Revelation and the Bible.<sup>3</sup> The actual finding of the Word of God in the Bible, however, is not the simple matter which some may imagine. We do not speak the Word of God if we simply repeat what stands in the Bible. One can think highly of the Bible and not hold it for the Word of God. He who, face to face with the question how the Bible is the Word of God, does not come into great perplexity creates the suspicion that hitherto he has held some theory of the Word of God, in place of believing and hearing the Word of God itself. It is not a question to be settled by theories of inspiration. There is no question of such decisive significance for theology, and for the Church to-day, says Gogarten, as 'how is the Bible the Word of God?' His own answer would be that only in the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and in the concrete existential moment, does the Bible become the Word of God to a man. We can speak or hear the Word of God only as those who belong to the Church, and are distinguished from those who do not belong to the Church by the knowledge of our sin.

Gogarten is much occupied with the problem of the sermon, with the problem of those who are called Sunday by Sunday to speak the Word. For if we have no word of God to speak, our speech, be it ever so beautiful and pious, is an idle gossip in which we merely reflect ourselves. He reminds us that, according to the Reformers, Christ was present in the Word as preached, so that Luther could say, 'that God will not think less when a man preaches

<sup>1</sup> *Illusionen*, 101.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, 73.

<sup>3</sup> *Glaube und Wirklichkeit*, 118-140.

His word than if He Himself did it.' But to-day the faith is largely lost that Christ is present in His Word, and men go 'to hear Mr. So-and-So.' The sermon has become a mere exhortation or encouragement to the life and doing that are to follow. This is the crisis of to-day, and it has gone deep. For when the sermon fails to be the real presence, then the Church of the Word fails, and the way is open for Roman Catholicism. The sermon becomes a problem, or an appendage. The decisive question to-day, he says, is not whether the Church can *do* anything, but whether it knows how to speak the Word of God, God's own creating, delivering, sanctifying Word.<sup>1</sup>

We turn to Gogarten as an Ethical Teacher.

Faith leads the Christian man into the pressure of life from without and within, and sets before him the decision of obedience, from case to case, to the claim of the neighbour. With that, the ethical problem arises for Gogarten, who brings Dogmatics and Ethics into the closest relation. To do justice to his ethical teaching, perhaps his most challenging contribution, would require a separate article.

He breaks sharply with traditional Christian ethics, as well as with the categorical imperative, regarding them both as unevangelical, and contrary to the Christian doctrine of justification by faith. In place of an ethics of conscience, he substitutes an ethics of grace.<sup>2</sup> The natural conscience in man who is fallen from God is not the organ of divine revelation. Only in man, redeemed from his independence by being justified by faith, and claimed of God, does conscience become resonant with revelation. That means the transformation of the autonomous unconditioned freedom of the confident conscience into the comforted conscience which places itself for light and guidance under divine grace. In the ordinary view, the ethical is determined from the relation of man to God, that is, from law. In Gogarten's view the ethical is determined from the relation of God to man, that is, from grace. He reminds us that for Luther and the Reformers, God revealed Himself in the forgiveness of sins, which is not an ethical principle, but is a break with the actuality of the ethical. In the light of the forgiveness of sin, the highest morality belongs to the work of man.<sup>3</sup>

This ethics of grace must come into the sharpest contrast therefore with any ethics in whose middle point stands the idea of the good. Gogarten will know nothing of an ethic of human creation. The ethical activity of man can only arise from the

previous activity of the Divine Revelation. *Christian* ethic can have its well-spring only in justification by faith. A Christian is not good because he does good works, he does good works because he has been justified, and claimed of God for obedience.

The question frequently asked of this school, 'What, then, shall we do?' Gogarten answers with Barth: 'Keep the commandments.'<sup>4</sup> His ethical teaching leads neither to moral sloth, nor to chiliastic dreaminess, but to an actual strenuous obedience to the commandments and ordinances of God. He does not speak idealistically of Christianizing society, or leavening the state, or building the kingdom of God. We cannot realize the holy. God only can realize it. We cannot improve the world. God only can improve it. But by keeping the commandments, we can seek to preserve this old evil world from destroying itself. 'It is of no use to project new programmes, be they ever so clever. It is of value to do the simpler but sorer work of recognizing facts, not to strive after far goals, but to do that which lies to our hand. Actual sober work is that which alone avails.'<sup>5</sup>

It is from this standpoint that Gogarten develops his doctrine of divine ordinances. Man's self is determined by his place in society. He is what he is *through* the other, that is in responsibility. A father is a father through his child, a wife is a wife through her husband. There is no situation in life in which a man is for himself alone.<sup>6</sup> He always is bound to another. 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' contains the whole of Christian ethics. Gogarten believes that the Protestant Church owes it to the world to bring back again this sense of obligation to God's ordinances.<sup>7</sup> It cannot do it if its last word be freedom. Its last word must be obligation. He is of course aware that the old ordinances cannot simply be set up again in the old way. What is needed is a new and Christian basing of all the relations of life, in their deepest parts. And that is the Church's task. This doctrine of the neighbour is not to be turned into a hard sociological principle. It must remain inside the dynamic and personal relationship of 'I' and 'Thou' in the actual concrete situation of the individual.

Our purpose in these articles has been presentation rather than criticism. The dialectical theology owes much to Gogarten's clear analytic thinking, and in particular to his clarifying of the issues in the discussion of modern thought. As he disclaims all

<sup>1</sup> *Glaube und Wirklichkeit*, 179.

<sup>2</sup> *Illusionen*, 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1927, p. 206.

<sup>5</sup> *Illusionen*, 126.

<sup>6</sup> *Die Schuld der Kirche*, 21.

<sup>7</sup> *Glaube und Wirklichkeit*, 42.



attempt to formulate a complete theology, we have not the right to look for it. But certain defects seem inherent in his scheme of thought. There is wanting that interpenetration of near and far, present and future, which is a feature of the New Testament. The whole eschatology of the New Testament, the sense of the future, is lost sight of in his constant preoccupation with the present. Has not the New Testament an outlook on far horizons, and a vision of a coming Kingdom of God? Is there not wanting, for Gogarten, in the existential present, the eschatological hope?

Again, there is his intensive, almost exclusive, concentration on the revelation of God in the neighbour. One is led to ask: Is the claim of the neighbour the whole actuality of our existence? Does not God speak to us in the loneliness also, and make His claim upon us heard in our personal life and destiny; and in the changing situations in life, with their joys, and sorrows, and cares?

But it may be that the message of Gogarten, by being narrowed and directed with intensity on these points, as through a burning-glass, gains not only in concentration, but in power.

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

Flowers of His Heart:  
An Address for a Flower Service.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'The garden of the Lord.'—Gn 13<sup>10</sup>.

BEFORE we send these lovely flowers to bear their message of kindness and good cheer to the sick and the lonely, I shall ask them to say a few words.

The first thing they tell us is that God loves variety. What a marvellous assortment of colours and shapes and sizes—blues and pinks and yellows and reds—shaped like bells or dainty hoods or neat sun-bonnets or fluffy balls; some big as a child's face, like the sun-flower, some wee and modest, and drooping like the wood-violet. There are those which are sturdy children of the soil, and others that have to cling and climb in order to lift themselves to the sun. But, however different, all are beautiful, and all of them are serving their purpose in the garden of the Lord.

We are all flowers of God's heart. And not one of you is like the other. Here's a restless little fellow, never at peace for a moment. God has work for him to do. He requires the vitality of that overcharged little body for some big task in His world. There's a wee chap whose mind is full of questions. 'Why do the wheels go round, Mummy?' That inquisitive mind God needs, for He has many secrets still to be unfolded for the good of humanity, and the key which opens the door of knowledge is a 'why?' Then here is a gentle little girl: a quiet corner and a book are

more to her liking than romping. God requires men of action, but He needs also quiet hearers who will whisper: 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.'

Some people talk as though good folk were all alike—like peas in a pod. They have never looked on the beauty of human nature, which, like the loveliness of a garden, is the beauty of variety. It is natural to be a Christian, and to be a Christian is to be natural—yourself at your best.

How are we to be it? Look at that splendid dahlia: how did it come to be? Just a tiny seed it was, with a little soil about it, a little moisture added, and a little sunshine bestowed. But the soil through millions of years was preparing for the flower's coming, and the moisture for it was drawn from the mighty ocean, and the sunshine had travelled over ninety millions of miles to refresh it. For it volcanoes have belched, and through the long ice-ages glaciers have worn down the rocks, and light has streamed from distances unimaginable; all that it might blossom.

You think you know all about yourself? You hardly know the least wee bit! Of your baby sister a poet has written some lovely lines:

Where did you come from, baby dear?  
Out of the everywhere into here.

Where did you get your eyes so blue?  
Out of the sky as I came through.

How did they all come just to be you?  
God thought about me, and so I grew.

If you try hard to work it all out about yourself—everything that has happened to you, your parents, your home, your church, your school, the chances you've had, and why it has all happened, and where it began, and what it's all for—you come on a very big answer: 'God thought about you, and so you grew.' He has been behind it all. All the things we have been through—the joy, the sadness, the discipline—are God's fingers about us trying to shape us to loveliness of character, and beauty of soul. What these flowers are trying to tell us is that although they, and we who are God's flowers, seem to grow without thinking, Someone is thinking, and planning, and loving all the time. Shall we not then lift up our faces to Him, as they do, and let His sunshine so fill our life that all that is ugly may be driven out, and everything that is good may be brought to perfection?

But that is not the biggest secret about beautiful flowers. Have you ever heard of the golden oak? Its leaves are like sheets of the purest gold. They can't grow it in Britain, yet I know of one that thrives in a Scottish garden. How was it done? Upon a plain oak they grafted a cutting of the golden oak brought from abroad, and now that ordinary oak is bearing lustrous leaves which are not its own. Marvellous things are done by grafting delicately beautiful blooms on common plants: rare and wonderful blossoms are the result.

The winsomest lives I have known have been like that. Something divinely beautiful has been grafted upon them, and they bear a loveliness which is not altogether their own. It is their own, since they have made it theirs, but it is *not* their own in its origin—they are engrafted with Christ. To live in Him is the secret of true beauty. Shall we not then, through faith and loyalty, become united with Jesus, who is the 'altogether lovely,' and the beauty of the Lord our God shall be upon us.

#### 'Ich Dien—Your Man.'

BY THE REVEREND R. OSWALD DAVIES, LEICESTER.

'You belong to Christ.'—I Co 3<sup>23</sup> (Moffatt).

There is a legend that when a son was born to Edward I. in the magnificent castle of Carnarvon in the year 1284, he made him the first Prince of Wales. Those of you who have seen that ancient stronghold, which is the finest existing example of Edwardian architecture in our land, will remember its tall towers, its stately halls, and proud gates. You will remember more particularly the great Eagle Tower standing in open defiance of the centuries, and overlooking the lovely Straits of

Menai. In that tower, we are told, the little prince was born. Edward, after a grim struggle, had conquered the Welsh people and had built this stronghold to consolidate himself. But he had failed to conquer their hearts; the Welsh were still rebellious at heart. When, however, a little son was born to him in 1284 he did a very wise thing. He presented his child to the people of Wales as the first Prince of Wales, so making him their own. This touched the Welsh people, and by this master-stroke Edward won their hearts. The gift of a child wrought what neither castle nor army could ever do; it wrought a change in the life of that ancient people. Ever since, this fine gesture of the English king has been upheld. The heir to the English throne has, with unbroken record, been known as the Prince of Wales.

But not only has the designation come down to us from those ancient days, but the Prince's motto as well. The princely motto, as we all know, is 'Ich Dien.' Much speculation has been exercised regarding its meaning and derivation. It has been generally understood that it was derived from the German, meaning 'I serve.' Another theory, however, has been set forward, which seems a very feasible one. It is that the strange words 'Ich Dien' are not derived from the German, as we had thought, but rather from the Welsh. When Edward came to present his little son to the people of Wales, he said in rather broken Welsh, 'Eich Dyn,' meaning 'Your Man.'

What could have been more natural and appropriate than that? We may forgive Edward for his rather broken Welsh, for many another Englishman has since followed his example! Edward said, 'He is your man—your own Prince. He belongs to you.' It was a great gesture, I say; and, what is more, a gesture which, throughout the centuries, has been honourably upheld.

1. And does not this great gesture of Edward point to the greater gesture of God? Nineteen hundred years ago a Child was born in Bethlehem—born not in a castle but in a manger, but the very glory of heaven shone around Him. God said, 'He is your man. He is born amongst you—flesh of your flesh. He shall speak your language and live His life under conditions like your own. He shall indeed be yours—a Prince to rule over your hearts.' And God says the same to the girls and boys of to-day. He tells you that Jesus was a Child like yourselves, and that He understands everything about the life of a girl or boy. He is your Man—your Prince to rule over your hearts. Jesus then belongs to you and me. He is, indeed, our Man.



2. Jesus belongs to us; but do we belong to Him? God said, 'He is your Man.' Shall we go to Him and say, 'I am your man'? When Edward gave his little son to the Welsh people it was in order that he might serve them. He sent him forth into the very life of that people. Jesus would like to do that with us. He would like to know that we belong to Him, and that He can send us out to the service of the world. Will you say to Him, 'I am going to be your man. Do with me as you will.' That surely is a worthy aim for every girl and boy.

G. F. Watts, the great artist, once painted a beautiful picture. It is called 'Aspiration.' It is the picture of a handsome youth. He is clad in shining armour and holds a spear firmly in his hand. You can see that he is just ready to take up a very great and holy task, and that whatever foes he will have to face he will be unafraid. It is indeed the picture of Christ's man.

Put on then the shining armour of Christ. Be a knight of the Cross.

Make up your mind to fight His battles; to serve under His flag.

Be Christ's man, and one day you will enter the King's Palace.

### The Jay Walker.

BY THE REVEREND ALEX. BAXTER, HAWICK.

'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.'—Ps 119<sup>105</sup>.

In my newspaper the other day I came across this heading—'85 Jay Walkers killed in London Streets during the last Three Months.' They were people who crossed the road without due care.

Now I don't think I have ever seen a Jay walking. The Jay is a bird of the woods, in this country at any rate, and, even there, is more often heard than seen. He is a bird of fine feathers, but hardly of a pleasant voice. When I was a boy we used to sing a song about 'The Birdies' Ball,' and how they all came in their Sunday best from bush and tree to the Ball. And I remember it was said:

The awkward owl and the bashful jay  
Wished each other a very good day.

The Jay doesn't sound very bashful sometimes, but I can well imagine he was bashful at the 'Birdies' Ball.' Dancing would not be his strong point. He is not very good on his feet. 'He is a gentleman in looks, but walks like a yokel.' He has a lot of wisdom in his head, but somehow is not very wise with his feet. It is for this reason, no doubt, we have come to call certain people 'Jay Walkers.'

I'm afraid there is something of the 'Jay Walker' about a good many of us, not only in the way we cross roads, but in what the Bible calls 'walking'—that is, in our conduct. 'Ponder the path of thy feet' is a bit of advice many boys and girls need. The Bible is full of advice and warning about walking carefully and wisely, and in the right ways, and Jesus has a great deal to say about people who are 'Jay Walkers,' and so get into trouble.

Now the people who do not take care on our streets, and so get hurt sometimes, are not people who don't *know* what they should do, but people who don't *do it*. They have knowledge in their heads, but they don't put it into their feet—don't act on it. Are we not like that sometimes—Jay Walkers? We learn about how to be good, and then we forget to put it into practice. We read God's Word and memorize our Golden Text, Sunday by Sunday, and then we forget to act on what we learn, and we do what we ought not to do. In other words, we become 'Jay Walkers,' wise in our heads, but foolish in our walk.

I heard of a man who was visiting a friend in the country. It was dark when he set out for home, and the friend gave him a lantern. He had not gone far from the door, however, when there was a crash—he had tripped over some obstacle on the road. The friend went to see what had happened. 'That lantern of yours is no good!' said the man who had fallen. The other replied: 'The lantern is all right, only you held it to your head instead of to your feet.' That's just what we do sometimes with the Word of God. The writer of the 119th Psalm, however, knew better. I think you will understand now what he means in our text—'Thy word is a lamp *unto my feet*, and a light unto my path.' To him it was something that kept him in the right way, and helped him to walk in the way safely. He used the word of God to guide his feet into the way of life; he walked in the way of God's commandments. So let us beware of 'Jay Walking,' and remember that Jesus has left us an example that we should follow in His steps. He is the living Word to guide us, and the Way.

### The Christian Year.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

#### The Enemy within the Gates.

'A man's foes shall be they of his own household.'—Mt 10<sup>36</sup>.

The first light on this saying is given in the circumstances under which it was spoken. Christ

was sending His disciples on a mission, and is here preparing them for the difficulties that would attend their work. Our Lord clearly foresaw that the message with which they were charged would—in the first instance, and quite inevitably—disturb and disintegrate. For the time, at least, the demand for a higher loyalty would conflict with other loyalties on a lower level.

There was no escaping that. He Himself had not escaped it. His own brethren at first did not believe in Him. Even His mother had been among those who thought Him mad. And, in that matter also, the disciples—both the original Twelve and those whom they were to win—would find that they were not above their Master. Well-meaning hands would hold them back; old ties and instinctive affinities would exert their whole weight and even change to bitter resentment in the endeavour to prevent them following where conscience, duty, love to God, and the call of the world's need were drawing them.

That had all to be faced if the work was to be done. Their foes would be of their own household. They also would have to take up *that* cross, even as their Master had, and follow in His steps. The family is a Divine institution. But even that high thing might be, and often was, the foe of the highest, as in measure it is still, especially when its atmosphere is worldly and conventional. Meant to be the friend and helper of all things high and true, family instincts and associations may nevertheless become a real hindrance to the soul's deep life, taming the conscience, clipping the wings of high adventure, stifling the call of duty. And if that is still true in measure, after two thousand years of Christianity, what must it have been when the claim to follow Christ meant not only the outraging of convention, but also of religion as religion was understood and practised.

Such is the original setting of the saying. But, like all Christ's sayings, it touches a principle and is capable of universal application. In every age, and in every variety of circumstance the soul has to reckon with the foes within.

We have to do it in the *nation*. A few short years ago to be British was like a family bond. Nationally we felt more like a family in those tragic war years than ever within living memory. But a hatred or even a danger in common is but a poor foundation on which to build anything that is enduring. Only love can stand the test of time and experience; love based on a common devotion to an ideal above and beyond self-interest. For that which at first seems, in its call to a higher

loyalty, to disturb the family bond, is, in the long last, its only true security. It is not devotion to an ideal that wrecks homes, but the absence of all ideals; not religion, but worldliness that disintegrates and destroys. It is so for our little household, and it is so for the larger household, that wider family which in its inmost being a nation is, and which, in the time of the late war, our own nation seemed almost to become.

A community which puts self-interest in the place of Christ is doing itself and the world a poor service. Justice is a noble ideal, but nothing that is based on purely selfish motives can ever get within sight of justice. We need something more than the cry of more profits, on the one hand, or more wages, on the other, to build a just State upon. We need a deeper loyalty, a wider vision, the sense of obligation to a higher will, the spirit which honours God in all human arrangements and sees something of God in every one who wears a human face. And the feeling of kinship which comes with that is the only force which will drive out suspicion, uncharitableness, and hate, the fell powers which wreck human society, and are the true hindrances to the attainment of human good. For

The crest and crowning of all good,  
Life's final star, is brotherhood.

And

Here lies the tragedy of our race :  
Not that men are poor ;  
All men know something of poverty.  
Not that men are wicked ;  
Who can claim to be good ?  
Not even that men are ignorant ;  
Who can boast that he is wise ?  
But that men are strangers.

And what is true of the nation is true also of the *Church*. It is not anything outside of her the Church has to fear : it is the more subtle foes that are within. Lack of loyalty to Christ and to one another : the spirit of the cynic and the fault-finder, of the petty gossip-monger, of the murmurer and complainer throwing the spume of his own smallness on the great things of Christ ; oblivious all the while to that for which the Church stands, to the sacred trust of being a member of her, and to the deep, intimate spiritual happenings that constitute her real history in the sight of God and the rejoicing angels in heaven.

The costly timidities of the ecclesiastical diplomat, too, are among the foes within, and that rigid



adherence to tradition which is sheer cowardice, playing for safety when the need of the hour is courage, the spirit which, whenever a soul afire with God would leap the barriers of moribund tradition, or shock the conventional half-worldly notions of propriety, reaches out the restraining hand and affords but fresh proof that he who would truly follow Christ finds in his own household the foes of his highest life.

And, finally, this word describes the battle which every sincere disciple of Christ must fight within the arena of *his own breast*. The flesh warreth against the spirit, and for most of us it is a weary climb to the heights where there is heard 'no yelp of the beast.' The fox, the bear, and the serpent are all represented in the menagerie which each of us carries 'under his own hat.' Only when he hears the summons to follow Christ does a man become fully aware what a divided family is housed in his own bosom. Only then does he understand how true it is that Christ came not to send peace, but a sword; which does not mean that that is the intention of His gospel, but that it is its inevitable result in a human heart, or in a society not yet under law to conscience. There is no escaping that, and only in one way can the blessed discomfort and unrest be honourably settled, by coming under the sway of one supreme love and devotion. Our lower loyalties must yield to the supreme loyalty. It is the one way of escape from the misery of the divided heart.

And here we have the key to our Lord's saying that no one can truly follow Him who does not put first the things of His Cross and of His Kingdom. It is not an arbitrary condition: it is not an unreasonable demand. It is not a declaration that for those who comply with it life will be dull and grey thereafter. The truth is otherwise. It is not loyalty to the highest, but disloyalty, that cuts the cords of joy. It is not by taking Christ's way that we grow blind to the wonder and joy of the earth, and to the entrancing interest of being alive. It is far otherwise:

Heaven above is softer blue,

Earth around is sweeter green;

Something lives in every hue,

Christless eyes have never seen.

A man is never himself until he loves something more than self. He never gets the gift of his own soul until he surrenders it at the call of a supreme love. For then only is he delivered from the distraction of inward strife. Life is unified for him. The enemies within, the foes of his own

household, are, by the only power they must acknowledge, brought into subjection.<sup>1</sup>

#### NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Release of Personality.

'God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I.—Ex 3<sup>4</sup>.

It is a great moment in any man's life when God becomes to him a living reality. The value to us of these outstanding figures and personalities of the Old Testament is in their individual discovery of and encounter with God. We see them one by one coming by various experiences to the perception of something new to them about God, as Newton found something new about the universe when gravitation dawned upon him; as Madame Curie found something new about matter when the gleam of radium caught, not so much her eye, as her mind; as a daring experimenter with a balloon, whom the world thought mad, may be able to tell something new about the invisible cosmic rays which have been long known to be ceaselessly invading our earth. With this story of Moses it is not the fashion and time in which God invaded his life as a commanding reality, but what it did with the man himself that we would consider.

1. To begin with, we see that under a new consciousness of God, and of God dealing with and claiming him, a man gained for the first time a right grip upon himself. These Bible biographies are frank, and not one of them is more frank than this of Moses. We see him in his weakness as well as in his mastery. He is shown us as a man of uncommon capacities, but all of them uncontrolled, unorganized, and undisciplined. There is in him a capacity of fierce passion. He flew at a slave-driver, killed him, and shoved his body under the sand. It may have been justifiable homicide, but the point is that it was passion unrelated to purpose, uncontrolled by principle. At the other extreme there is in him a brooding and crippling diffidence. This is so manifest and so perverse that God is represented as being made angry by the man's flaccid self-excusing. How often in this chapter Moses says: 'Who am I?' He might well ask it. It was the first question he had to get answered. To underestimate the dignity and importance of himself is as disastrous for a man as to overestimate this, and here is a man for ever falling straight from the peril at one extreme into the peril at the other. We must hear how he found an

<sup>1</sup> C. Allan, *The New World*, 85.

answer to this, his first problem. Another personal pronoun fell on his ear. It was the 'I' of Almighty God. 'God said: I am that I am.' 'Certainly I will be with thee.' And at that the wavering, inconstant 'I' of Moses, one moment conceited and the next abject, was lost in the one tremendous revealing moment when that 'I' of Almighty God sounded and resounded.

This is not musty history. Here is our most constant problem. We are disorganized personalities. We want some secret of self-organization as the first stage to self-mastery. To hear the voice say to our unquiet soul, 'I am he that sent thee,' is to gain mental poise, moral security and serenity, spiritual purpose.

Without the privilege of any personal intimacy with the late Lord Haldane, I<sup>1</sup> was once for the space of some days able to observe him closely in the midst of an ordeal when he was the victim of distracting and irrational injustice. I was impressed by his unbroken serenity and poise. It was clearly not indifference, and it was not defiance. It was an unruffled inward calm and self-possession. When his autobiography was published the remembrance of this impression came back vividly, and I thought that I might in these intimate pages come upon the secret. I think that I found it in this passage: 'The belief that the more experience is spiritual the more it is real, has influenced me through the course of my life, during more than fifty years. There is little that matters when the principle is grasped and held to, and hesitation and even unhappiness become replaced by a life that is tranquil, because it is freed from dependence upon casual ups and downs. The real is the spiritual. All else is circumstance, trimmings, the dress of things.' Surely God took hold of both these men, one of our modern time, the other in the dawn of Israel's history, and shone into their souls, and in that light, conflict and chaos were resolved into order and unity, just as a great building may be lighted, not from the street, but through a great lens fixed at its summit, crowning an ample dome, and pouring a serene light into the whole.

2. There is a second clear thing in this Hebrew leader's story. It is that under the consciousness of the reality and claim of God he became conscious of duty. Not until then had he a just conception of how his life took hold upon other lives, and was bound up with the destiny of his people, and with the long purposes of God with them. Many a man has had this experience without having seen the bush that burns. There is the man who had a

time in his life when he felt the injustice of the world, and when he was younger he flung himself at it with hot, indignant energy. It cost him a good deal. It hindered some entirely legitimate purposes of his own. It left him in the end impressed with the littleness of his own power, and the impotence of any single effort. To-day he takes life as easily as he can, and though he pities the unfortunate, it is from a calculated distance. He still likes to hear about 'the enthusiasm of humanity,' and the phrase in his own mouth brings back a familiar taste. He, too, was once on fire. But it all burned out. In his time he has even stood over a dead Egyptian. But it did not save Israel. This man is as Moses was, on one side of the burning bush. There is a change on the other side of that bush. He has found God, and finding God has found himself a man with duties and opportunities. Across the quiet sky under which he has placidly watched his flock, he now sees written, 'Let my people go.'

It looks as if God can do nothing for Israel until He has done something with Moses, the shepherd exile. This dialogue between a persuading God and a shrinking man is strangely impressive. Human history makes its recurrent comment upon this. The crowning comment is the fact of the Incarnation itself. It is by humanity that God redeems humanity. Every movement which has lifted man into a little more light and freedom has had God's sent man at the heart of it, and the answer to the question of the old Chartist hymn is that God will save the people—save them from war, exploitation, the destroying of secularism, and all through the sinister list—when He is able to find people to save them through.

3. The final thing to be taken note of in this old story concerns the method of the revelation which so changes and charges a man. It is the commonness of the medium of revelation. Perhaps a gorse bush with the light of the evening sun on it. Many a man had seen it and seen nothing. Moses had seen it, or its like, where there was no revelation for him in it. Then one day God shot through the commonplace. That is the way of God. Why did not Moses see as much as this long before he did? Why had he not seen it when he had his controversy with the Egyptian slave-driver? Just as much principle and just as much righteousness were involved then as now. There was just one difference. There was not so much of Moses, and not enough in him until now. He had not before been able to see that God was behind the whole human question. The bush without the flame

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thomas Yates.



was like abstract truth and principle without God in them. It was inoperative for great ends. Here, at last, is Right ablaze with a Presence; Truth flaming with a Spirit. That truth burns for us of to-day not in a thicket of moorland, but in a Person.<sup>1</sup>

#### TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Foundations of our Teaching.

'Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.'—Mt 13<sup>33</sup>.

This parable, which was contained in one of the earliest gospel sources, is of profound importance in estimating our Lord's outlook. It is difficult to interpret it in any rational way, except as explaining that He foresaw clearly what was implied in the spread of Christianity, that He contemplated, not, as some people have imagined, that speedy coming of the end of all things, but the spread of His message throughout the world in exactly the way in which it has spread. And this seems to be corroborated also, if we think carefully of His own methods. It is important that we should consider what is the right way of spreading Christianity. It is sometimes suggested that we should adopt the methods of business, and advertise our goods in the way that business men do; that a column or a page of *The Times* would be an admirable way for making known the message of Christianity. It is suggested that we should adopt means similar to those used in political propaganda, on the assumption that if you only say a thing often enough, however unintelligently, people must begin to think that it is true.

Then, again, we have most of us a real fear of proselytism; we know how harmful a thing it may be when it is carried out by people with whom we do not agree, and we dread doing anything of the same sort ourselves. But, as will appear, the methods of proselytism are the exact antithesis of the methods which we should pursue. Its characteristic is to consider arguments rather than truth, and to use influence or suggestion or authority to override a person's will and intelligence. The true methods of Christianity are the exact opposite of this.

We suggest three principles to follow. The first is the paramount influence of truth, the second the influence of personality, the third the power of teaching. For what we have to do is surely to

follow most of all the example of our Lord Himself: to consider what were the ways in which He worked, how He spread His message, and on what lines His appeal was made. These three headings sum up the methods of His work.

1. That which is really true is what must ultimately prevail. It may be retarded or kept back by outside causes, it may be hampered by the unworthiness of those who are its messengers, but ultimately, whatever happens, truth—i.e. the highest truth before the world at the time—will prevail. This is exactly what our Lord's methods seem to teach us. He had a message to give, a message which we believe to have been the truth—the truth, indeed, expressed in language and forms of the time when He taught, but emphatically the truth. He delivered that message, but He always seems to have shown what we may call a curious unconcern as to what happened to it. He took no steps for expressing it in absolutely correct form, but simply gave His message to the world and lived His life, knowing that as it was the truth thrown on the world, therefore, ultimately, it must spread and prevail.

But there are two characteristics about the spread of Christianity. It is entrusted to human beings who will all have learned the truth, but will all hold it more or less imperfectly, and the actual spread of it depends on the extent to which each person has grasped and taken hold of the truth, and his capacity for interpreting it. There are many enthusiastic people who, having got a very imperfect idea of what Christianity means, are anxious to spend their time spreading it abroad. They are impatient of what they call academic methods; they ask for something practical. There is something which, no doubt, they feel and know is truth, and they are ready to put aside all the difficult questions which people may puzzle over. It may be that they have seized and grasped just an aspect of truth which at the moment and for the time responds to the need of people, and, therefore, they may have a temporary and partial success in their message. But there has never been a great religious movement which has not had behind it real earnest intellectual thought about Christianity. Take, for example, certain periods in the history of Christianity. During the third century Christianity spread far and wide in the Roman Empire, so that at the end of that time it had become formidable enough to rouse in a remarkable way the resentment of the old paganism. It became so strong as to be able to resist the attacks of organized persecution, and almost immediately

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Yates, in *C.W.P.* cxx. 289.

it became the established religion of the Empire. Now that movement was prepared for by a body of Christian theologians who had succeeded in interpreting the Christian faith in such a way as to be the most true exposition of life for the people of the day. Clement, Origen, and their pupils were undoubtedly deeper thinkers than any of their contemporaries. From the Catechetical School of Alexandria there issued on the one side the reformed pagan philosophy of Neo-Platonism; on the other side Catholic Christianity, and that Christianity put before them by far the highest and truest exposition of life and truth that was possible for them.

Or take, again, the Middle Ages. The Middle Ages present to us Christianity as the ruling principle which moulded the whole of human life. What enabled it to do this was that Christian thought dominated the human mind. In the mingled history of human thought which has succeeded the Reformation, we might illustrate our principle in many ways. Whenever there is a great movement of religious life there is always earnest intellectual effort behind it. The Oxford Movement, for example, was a representation of Christianity more ideal and more philosophical than anything existing at the time. It represented by far the biggest message which the University of Oxford had for the moment; therefore attained for a time a dominant influence in the University, and became a great power in the country. But it had many elements of imperfection, and that weakened its force, and the followers have not kept up the vigorous intellectual life of the founders.

If the work of the Church is to be successful, there must be an earnest effort made by Christian thinkers to grapple with intellectual problems. We cannot shelve them. Every individual must deal with those problems for himself. The reasons why many people do not go to church are that they feel the things that they hear are not quite true, that they get no answer to the questions that are puzzling them, that the things that they hear are out of touch with their thought.

2. If we ask what it is that has made the gospel's appeal to such an infinite number of men in so many generations, so many ages, so many countries, it is the influence of the Personality of Christ, and that was the case not, as some seem to think, only in particular ages of the Church, but in all ages. It is Jesus, it is the influence of Jesus on people's lives and thoughts, that has always been the fundamental appeal of Christianity. And if that is true of His methods, and if we have to follow

His example, we must remember that our personality will have much influence. And that is why we must, as a preliminary to the teaching of our message, live it. The true gnostic is not he who only knows about Christianity, but he who lives in accordance with Christ's teaching. Our influence will depend upon what sort of persons we gradually show ourselves to be—whether we are sincere, true, and to be relied upon—that in the first place, but there is something more. People will gradually find out whether we have a religious message to give and can speak to them, when the time comes, as if our religion was real.

3. And then, thirdly, there is our duty of teaching. How did our Lord give His message to the world? It was by teaching: 'And he taught them many things.' It is specially emphasized that He taught, and the records of His work are the records of His teaching. The essence of teaching is that ultimately its appeal is to the intellect. How singularly little there is of the appeal to the emotions in the Gospels. It is thought that the spiritual means something different from the intellectual; it is thought that the spiritual means the emotional, that the spirit is something which will enable us to escape from the control of reason. We have not any justification in the Bible for any such conception. The spiritual means the sanctified intellect and the sanctified moral life. The fruits of the spirit are love, joy, and peace; the spirit is the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might. Our duty is to go as teachers; in our work of teaching we must use all our powers of mind and character. There is a danger that new things spread eagerly, but that about old things people are satisfied with what is. There is an immense propaganda going on at the present day of all sorts of erroneous messages and half-truths. The half-truth often seizes the mind with extraordinary power, and drives people on to teach it. We must not allow ourselves to remain in a sluggish intellectual state. We must fulfil our mission of preaching the gospel.<sup>1</sup>

#### ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Sin of Contempt.

'The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are.'—Lk 18<sup>11</sup>.

It is difficult not to feel contempt when we are brought face to face with certain kinds of baseness

<sup>1</sup> A. C. Headlam, *The Building of the Church of Christ*, 170.



—like treachery or ingratitude—and difficult not to show that we despise men who are guilty of sins like these. Nevertheless, contempt at bottom is essentially unchristian. When we meditate on some of its examples and manifestations, we begin to understand that it proceeds from a belief in the worthlessness of mankind. There are people who look at their fellow-beings with the eyes of Timon, and discern only the mean motives, the smug pretensions, the pompous dullness, the ignoble ambitions, the selfish cruelties, which disfigure human nature. Dean Swift represents the terrible outcome of this dark, embittered spirit, which he poured out in *Gulliver's Travels*. Before the book ends its savage scorn grows intolerable. We recoil from writers, however gifted, who hold men to be mostly fools or, as Swift would imply, mere brutes in disguise. Sarcasm is the proper dialect to express such a contempt for humanity. Carlyle himself declared sarcasm to be the language of the devil, and provoked the retort that one might almost say it was Carlyle's mother-tongue. Voltaire, again, incarnated that sneering temper which contradicts the gospel. Even so fine a critic as Matthew Arnold marred much of his work by its tone of mockery. The typical modern Antichrist is Mephistopheles—and we may recognize him by his satanic sneer.

Even toleration may proceed from mere disdain. There was true Roman arrogance about Gallio when he refused to trouble himself with foreigners wrangling over their wretched superstitions :

Whether ye follow Priapus or Paul,  
I care for none of these things.

The Divine Person who meets us in the New Testament has this supreme characteristic, that He is utterly innocent of scornfulness. He humbled Himself, and He emptied Himself, yet it was without a stain of condescension. Concerning the King of Love we read that His face was wet with weeping, and we can be confident, though we have no record, that He smiled on the children when He gathered them into His arms. But always His pure eyes shone with immortal tenderness and compassion. Even in His anger and His grief at the hardness of men's hearts there was no contempt. He lived despised and rejected ; but He Himself never despised and never rejected the meanest human creature. It would be like blasphemy to imagine a sneer on the countenance of the Son of Man. Again and again He warned His disciples against the wickedness of disdain. Take heed, He said with solemn emphasis, and beware of covetousness

—the lust for possessions. Take heed that ye do not your alms before men—beware of self-display. But above all, take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones—beware of cherishing contempt for any man or woman or child. For this is the deadly leaven of the Pharisees, the sin of the superior person. Not a few Christians have stumbled at the stern sentences in the Sermon on the Mount with which our Lord condemned passionate anger expressed in words of scorn. But 'Raca,' as a wise expositor points out, implies contempt for a man's head : it means 'you idiot' ; while the term rendered 'fool' carries contempt for a man's heart and character : it means 'you scoundrel.' And the doom which Christ pronounced against this inhuman scorn reveals His own burning abhorrence of such a sin.

Now the temptation to cherish contempt, which is the sin of the superior person, besets people of every age and condition of life. Class pride is a hateful spirit from which no class or rank is exempt. We see it infecting socialists, as well as capitalists and professors and peers. A decent Christian to-day will shrink from the vulgarity of despising poor men who are badly off. Yet, do we never look down upon half-educated folk, with their crude taste and cheap knowledge and narrow horizon ? History, however, seems to prove—as James Spedding once remarked—that 'God was never particular about giving His favourite children a good education.' God, at any rate, shows no preference for University men. In His eyes, respect of persons is equally sinful, whether we base it on culture or on wealth. 'What are the differences of our endowments to Him from whom we all come, and to whom we all return ?' Pride of race, again, is harder to eradicate, inasmuch as the roots of this pride lie deep among our inherited instincts and subconscious antipathies. Yet every Christian believes that the Divine love is colour-blind to racial distinctions ; while in the elemental human experiences we admit that there is no difference left between the white soldier and Gunga Din. Still more subtle and more deadly is 'grace pride,' as a quaint old preacher called it—the self-importance of the Pharisee who contrasts himself with other religious men less earnest in piety, and less strict in conduct. This is the temptation which lies in wait round the doors of spiritual retreats and conventions and conferences, and dogs the footsteps of the ardent seeker after God. How can such a one escape the consciousness that he has reached a higher level than ordinary believers ?

Dr. Alexander Francis has recorded how, while

he was resident in Russia, a certain 'social worker' from Chicago begged to be introduced to Tolstoi. At their interview the American described his methods of rescue work in the slums of that wicked city: 'We go down to the drunkards and harlots and try to pull them up to the rock on which we stand.' And then, continues Dr. Francis, 'the storm that I had seen gathering burst upon the astonished man. "You miserable creature," said Tolstoi, more in sorrow than in anger, "do you know that your heart is full of Pharisaic pride, and that it was upon such sins of the spirit and not on sins of the flesh that He whom you call Lord and Master poured the vials of His wrath? Will no one organize a mission of drunkards and harlots to save the souls of those who, by their secret sins of swelling pride and petty meanness, by their bitter jealousies and narrow sectarianism, are kept out of the Kingdom into which the open sinners enter, saved as by fire, yet saved by the grace of Christ in them, manifesting itself in the humility, the charity, and the self-loathing of their hearts?"'

By strange and devious paths men may climb into the seat of the scornful; but to sit in that seat is to betray and deny Jesus Christ. He requires His disciples to look at men with His eyes, to measure them by His standard, to feel for them with something of His ardour. Outwardly, indeed, they may appear contemptible creatures—mentally deficient, or morally and physically degraded, or spiritually deaf and blind. Nevertheless, 'as the brothers of Christ, as belonging to His sacred kind, as the objects of His love in life and death, they must be dear to all to whom He is dear. And those who would for a moment know His heart and understand His life must begin by thinking of the whole race of man, and of each member of the race, with awful reverence and hope.'<sup>1</sup>

#### TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### Friendship.

'A friend loveth at all times.'—Pr 17<sup>17</sup>.

'I have called you friends.'—Jn 15<sup>15</sup>.

'Without a friend thou canst not live well. And if Jesus be not above all thy friend thou wilt be very sad and desolate.'—THOMAS A KEMPIS, *The Imitation of Christ*.

1. *The Friendship of Men.*—In the words of Bacon, 'If he have not a friend, a man may quit the stage.' Almost every one who is human at all desires friends. They may desire nothing else

that is good and lovely, but they do desire friendship. 'Without a friend thou canst not live well.' You cannot even be yourself until you have somebody who loves you and whom you love. You realize that there are in you all sorts of capacities and powers of love which unanswered, unresponded to, leave you only half-alive. Those who desire friends desire something that is a fundamental human need. Love is the very foundation of a man's being. If he has not got it in his life, he cannot express himself. Our language, our poetry, our literature, is full of phrases about the joy of love. 'Fellowship is heaven; the lack of it hell,' is an almost hackneyed saying.

Oh, friend, my bosom said,

Through thee alone the sky is arched,

Through thee the rose is red.

And yet how baffled sometimes is that hunger for love! Have we not seen people with great gifts, and with opportunities of making friends, who yet do not make friends? A boy goes perhaps through his school and college and then enters a business or profession where there are others of his own age; and yet makes no friends, though he heartily wishes that he could. How does that happen? It is born of the eternal paradox: 'He that seeketh to lose his life shall save it, and he that seeks to save it shall lose it.' That is more true of love than of anything else in the world. He that seeketh love shall lose it, because there is some strange quality in that desire for love, that desire to *get* rather than to *give*, which isolates him, which makes him lonely. The first thing a man has to do (and, indeed, it is the hardest thing of all) is to forget his hunger and thirst for love, and to remember that all the world is hungry. He, perhaps, can give even when he cannot get. That seems indeed almost impossible to some of us. But we have often to pray, 'Lord, make that possible to me by Thy grace, which by nature seems impossible.' For the lonelier we are the more impossible it seems to put ourselves aside and to ask, 'What can we *give*?' instead of 'What can we *get*?'

The incapacity for making friends may become a habit. It is a habit that becomes fixed. A man must break it while he is young, and acquire the habit of being more interested in others than in himself.

There are people who are jealous of their friend's friends, of their friend's work, sometimes of their friend's own past, present, and future interests. To be jealous of your friend's friend—that strikes at the very heart of friendship. To want to keep

<sup>1</sup> T. H. Darlow, *The Love of God*, 192.



a friend to yourself so that no one else may share at all—there is a vice of which one may well be ashamed. And yet is there any vice on earth more common, more hard to bear, or more hard to conquer? If God is just, surely He will not punish jealousy, for jealousy punishes itself! It is so suffocating, so stifling, that it destroys love itself at last. The friendship of the jealous soul is associated with continual reproaches and bitterness and anger; and love cannot flourish in an atmosphere like that. 'He that seeketh to save his life shall lose it.' You cannot allow jealousy to enter in without damaging, if not in the end destroying, the relationship between you and your friend.

To be ready to understand—that is indeed a part of friendship; but to clamour for the right to understand all—that is a thing that the human soul cannot endure. Who will so give himself away? Who does not ask himself at times whether any one who knew us as we really are could love us? Those who ask *everything* are asking for that which they will not themselves give.

What is true of human nature is that it almost always responds to love; that when it loves it desires to serve; that when it fails, nine times out of ten, it is because of some misunderstanding, or sudden panic; that such failure does not always mean fundamental wickedness, although on the surface it seems to. That is true of human nature, and that our Lord understood. He expected the best possible, but He did not pretend. And I think that we in our friendships would often be much more secure and much more happy if our friends also treated us with fundamental sincerity, not pretending that we are better than we are, not refusing to see us as we are, with all our faults upon us; but seeing us *as* we are, believing the best possible of us, and still loving us. To be understood, and yet valued and loved—that is peace and joy indeed. Without this, there is always anxiety, fear that when one's friend knows all, affection will die; dread that we shall not always be loved.

Alas! that neither bonds nor bars,

Can certify possession.

Torments me still the fear lest love

Died with its last expression.

2. *The Friendship of God.*—When we read of the way in which our Lord treated His friends, we realize the feeling that prompts the desire for a perfect understanding. That saying of Rudyard Kipling's—'Only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame'—expresses a peace that one wins only perhaps after years of struggling

to get the praise and the just blame of our fellow human beings. We realize at last that this is impossible.

One of the things that strikes us most in thinking of our Lord's attitude to His friends is the extraordinary severity of His rebukes, and the apparently complete absence of resentment on their part. Our Lord says to one of the dearest of His friends, 'Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.' To James, to Philip, to Nathanael, and even to John, the beloved disciple, He addresses words of criticism and blame, sometimes almost terrible in their severity; yet there is a complete absence of resentment. Surely this came from the fact that the disciples realized that our Lord loved them intensely; that He knew their goodness. When they were bad He rebuked them, but it was not their badness that occupied a prominent place in His mind; it was their goodness. He saw the glorious possibilities that there were in that little band of disciples. They were to be the light of the world. They entered into His most sacred experiences. He loved and trusted them. Surely that is why they never resented His anger against them, although they must have been wounded by it. Such sincerity kills sentimentality.

That we should be a friend of one who, for our sakes, is indignant when we sink beneath ourselves, but not a whit the less joyful when we rise above ourselves, should make us almost immune from the desolation of spirit that comes when our earthly friends do not understand us. To be in the relation of friendship with one who knows us with a clearness of vision that we can never attain ourselves, and yet loves us, gives us a sense of deep security and peace. After all, there is no joy on earth like that joy; nor should we resent the pain that comes of being rebuked, because of the happiness of being wholly understood. For all of us this friendship of God is possible.

Does this seem to put too human an interpretation on the idea of God? When humanity arrives at the point of developing a great spiritual religion, it produces a doctrine like the doctrine of the Trinity. God is absolute; He is infinite; He is something infinitely greater than a person, although He includes personality. The way in which this can be most easily expressed is to say that He is one God, but three Persons; a Trinity like Beauty, Truth, and Goodness, like body, soul, and spirit, like many other fundamental things. In the God-head, therefore, there is included that wonderful

thing which we call 'personality,' and it is included in a sense far beyond our imagination. Personality is not less in the Godhead than in us. It is, there, more wonderful, more complex, than we, with our limited little minds, can possibly imagine.

There are people who, in their anxiety to escape from the irreverence and stupidity of thinking of God as a human being, put aside the very idea of friendship with God, and deny themselves the sense of His intimate affection for each of us, thinking, 'How is it possible that the absolute God should know or care about anything so small as myself?' But when we try in this way to escape from too human an idea of God, we are really falling into it more deeply than ever. We not only think of God as a man, but as a busy man, a man who is too great and important to see any one but the heads of departments! He has the universe to look after; how can He look after us? But is it not the most elementary form of anthropomorphism to think of God in terms of size? If God is absolute and unconditional, the fact that our affairs are small and the universe large has no meaning to Him. All things are equally dear and equally present in His mind, and to think otherwise is to attribute to God, not only personality, which we

are trying to escape from, but the narrow limitations of human personality. There is no size in the mind of God, and when we approach God as friend, let us be sure that our affairs are as dear to Him as the sustaining of the universe. 'Oh, taste and see how gracious the Lord is.'

So gracious is He that some have even claimed that they were God's favourites. That idea is repulsive to us; but let us think what it means. We see how it arises, when we look at the experience of the saints. We find that they experienced a sense of tenderness and care and understanding; they walked and talked with God as Friend, so that it was almost pardonable that they should think of themselves as more the friends of God than other people. Their friendship brings such peace that those who know it, even in the least way, desire beyond anything to proclaim it to the world. For the friends of God know His peace which passeth understanding. They are lifted above jealousy, resentment, and anxiety. They suffer—God forbid that any human being should *not* suffer—when human friends have failed them or they have failed their friends, but their suffering is not to the death of the soul, and in the sanctuary of their being is peace.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. Maude Royden, *The Friendship of God*, 2.

## Contributions and Comments.

### 'In my Father's house are many mansions' (Jn. xiv. 2).

ON p. 211 of his admirable volume *The Johannine Writings* (1927), my late dear friend, Dr. J. Estlin Carpenter, infers from Irenæus' quotation (*Haer.* v. xxxvi. 3) of this passage (Jn 14<sup>2</sup>) as a saying of the Lord reported by 'the Elders' that we may ascribe the report 'with great probability' to John 'the disciple of the Lord; who is thus identified by Papias with both books, the Revelation and the Gospel.'

Were this the meaning, we should read here in Irenæus: 'And therefore, as John reports, our Lord said, In my Father's house are many mansions.' We may be the more sure of this because in v. xxxiii. 4, where Irenæus quotes from Papias a 'tradition of John,' he is careful to mention 'John' by name, mistaking the Elder for the Apostle.

It is by no means insignificant that the logion is *not* cited here from 'John' but from 'the Elders.' We grant, indeed, to the consensus of critics that 'the Elders' are tacitly borrowed by Irenæus from Papias, just as he professedly borrows them from Papias in v. xxxiii. 3 f. In the present quotation, where 'John' is *not* mentioned, 'the Elders' base their argument on Mt 13<sup>8</sup> (note the order 100, 60, 30, not 30, 60, 100, as in Mark). They infer that there are three 'abodes' or zones of bliss in the world to come, Heaven, Paradise (a glorified Palestine), and 'the city' (that is, glorified Jerusalem). Irenæus (with or without suggestion from the Elders) supports this further by analogy of the heavenly banquet, which is spread as a triclinium whereat the guests would necessarily recline in three divisions (cf. Lk 14<sup>7-14</sup>). He then expressly quotes again 'the Elders' from whom just before he had taken the reference to the logion, and supports



their view by appeal to 1 Co 15<sup>25</sup>. Our concern is neither with Irenæus' reference to the triclinium nor that to Paul, but only with the Elders' reference to the logion.

Its wording is not precisely that of Jn 14<sup>2</sup>; moreover, the sense applied is a commonplace of Jewish apocalyptic (cf. Apoc. Bar. xlviii. 6; Bar. iii. 24; Enoch lxxi. 16, and tractate *Shabbath* 15<sup>2a</sup>); in fact, Jewish apocalyptic, in particular Apoc. Baruch, is the resort of 'the Elders' for similar eschatological data. Thus in *Haer.* v. xxiii. 3 f. they predict the miraculous fertility of (glorified) Palestine by an alleged saying of 'the Lord.' But the alleged logion is simply a midrash of Gn 27<sup>27, 28</sup> combined with Is 65<sup>8</sup>, which appears in almost identical terms in Enoch x. 19 and Apoc. Bar. xxix. 5. On these grounds some critics have refused to accept the logion on the 'many abodes' as really derived from the Fourth Gospel, holding it to be a mere current saying taken up by Elders and Evangelist alike from oral tradition.

I am disposed to think there is truth on both sides. Since Papias used 1 Jn (Euseb. *H.E.* iii. xxxix. 16), it is highly probable that he also knew the Gospel. On the other hand, his relative neglect of it (like that of his contemporary Justin), and most of all the absence of anything which can be considered an account of its origin (the late Latin fragment 'Manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis a Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto' relates to Revelation only; cf. Rev 1<sup>9-11</sup>) from Papias' account of written apostolic records, make it equally probable that he did *not* regard it as apostolic. We can only infer that in the time of Papias and Justin the Fourth Gospel had not yet received

the supplementary Appendix (Jn 21), in which the reader is cautiously, yet unavoidably, led to believe it the work of the Apostle John.

It is possible that neither 'the Elders,' nor Papias who appeals to them, was influenced at all by Jn 14<sup>2</sup> in using the 'many mansions' logion. On the whole the closeness of resemblance is such that we must infer 'with great probability' that Papias (not necessarily the Elders) *was* influenced by it. All the more striking, then, is the fact that he does *not* refer it to 'John' at all, whether Elder or Apostle, but simply to 'the Elders.' Those who yield credence to Eusebius' strained theory of an Elder John at Ephesus will doubtless hail this result as confirmation thereof. In reality it only shows that Papias included the 'nameless Elder' of 2 Jn 1 and 3 Jn 1 among 'the Elders' from whose reported words he collected material. His 'traditions of John' were doubtless obtained from travellers who 'came his way' from Palestine, of whom Polycarp would be the typical example. But there is nothing in his preface to exclude such another as the 'nameless' Ephesian elder, author of the Epistles and the Fourth Gospel, whose familiarity with Palestinian scenes and traditions is unmistakable.

B. W. BACON.

New Haven, Connecticut.

This note must have been one of the last things Professor Bacon wrote, and it is fitting that it should appear in the same number as Professor Moffatt's excellent account of his work (p. 437). Professor Bacon was a very old and valued contributor to this magazine.—EDITORS.

## Entre Nous.

### Thinking Black.

The natives around Lake Nyasa are said to learn to speak English with an Aberdeen accent, and this may well be, for the two great pioneers of Christianity in Central Africa, Laws and Hetherwick, were sent out from the Granite City. Between them they gave more than a century of service in Africa, and now Dr. Hetherwick has given the fruits of his ripe experience in *The Gospel and the African* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net). He writes with rare insight and sympathy and with a most

attractive modesty. Here is no smart journalese, but the profound reflections of a deeply thinking Christian man. 'To think as an African thinks, "thinking black," as it has facetiously been called—is an achievement impossible to me as a white man. The black man's whole upbringing, environment, and outlook have raised a high wall between his mind and mine, that I have never got over—a wall built by generations of heredity in an atmosphere vastly different from mine. This difference shows itself in a mentality ruled by influences and



motives and powers that have no place in my logic of cause and effect. The African is moved and swayed by unseen and mystic influences that have no place in the white man's process of reasoning, and the path through his field of thought is one impossible for the white man to follow.'

#### Five Barley Loaves.

'The missionary of these new days has abandoned the old attitude to the faiths of the heathen world, which looked upon them as wholly erroneous, and therefore to be denounced and set aside. He is taught, rather, to look for elements of truth among these non-Christian faiths and to utilize them as foundation-stones on which to build up the fabric of truth he has come to teach. As our Blessed Lord used the five small barley loaves and the two little fishes of the Galilean lad to make, with His blessing, a feast for the thousands on the hill slope of Galilee, so will the wise teacher of the Gospel take into his hands the fragments of truth which these native faiths possess, and, with the blessing of the Lord on them, pass them back enriched by the fuller revelation of divine truth he can throw on them.'

#### The Good Heart.

'The young missionary has not long been settled before he realizes that the African has no desire for his teaching, nor any sense of the need of that gospel which he has come to impart. His limited knowledge of the native tongue keeps him from understanding much of the talk going on daily around him. He sees enough, however, during those few months to make him conscious of the difficulty of the task he has set his face to, and to ask himself, "How am I to begin?"'

'The best answer is to seek for no answer—but just to begin—to begin with the task lying immediately to his hand. This, in the experience of every pioneer missionary, is to build his station—to employ his native workers, and possibly to teach them their tasks—to work alongside them, to live among them day by day, week after week—all the while watching them and studying them—learning more and more of their language, more and more of their tribal habits and customs—getting daily nearer and nearer to them—though feeling as if they were receding more and more from him, in thought, in feeling, and in mutual understanding one of another. That on his side. But on their side, while he is studying them, they are studying him—with that wonderful insight of theirs for character, they are

reading him through and through. With keen, microscopic eyes they mark his little traits of character—any weaknesses he may display are rapidly noted—characteristics he may hardly be aware of himself at all. Every hour of the day he is under observation. And then in the evening round the village fire, or on the flat rock where the women place the mortars in which they pound their household grain, he is discussed, his character for patience or kindness or courtesy, or that "good heart" which stands so high in native estimation. These are all weighed and measured with an accuracy that would astonish the subject of it and make him think more humbly of himself. While, therefore, he is thus learning to know his people, his people are learning to know him.

'And that is how he begins. That is his first sermon, his first lesson of religious instruction—the best lesson he will ever teach during all the after years of his work in Africa—the lesson of his own life.'

#### By their Fruits.

'It is through this instinct for character and his appreciation of the higher qualities of life, with which character is associated, that the Gospel finds its readiest appeal to the heart of the native; and, through appreciation of the highest source of that character, he is drawn to the Christian faith. The youngest Christian born anew, imperfect though he often is, wins his admiration and then his envy. "What was it that first led you to think of Christ and Christianity?" I have asked my young candidates for entrance into the catechumenate. I have had various answers. "It was a dream," some said. "It was the reading of the Word of God," said others. "It was a sermon"—this not very frequently. Most frequent of all was the answer, "It was Thomas—or James—or Luke," naming some Christian convert or companion whose changed manner of life had stamped itself on his admiration. This impact of the Christian character on the mind and conscience of the African is, I believe, the greatest power the Gospel wields in bringing him to a knowledge of himself and his moral and spiritual needs.'

#### Members One of Another.

'The conception of the Christian Church brings to the African a wider and fuller sense of unity than he ever hitherto conceived of in his village, clan, and tribal institution. By his membership in the Church he is brought into a new relationship

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel and the African*, 100.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, 128.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, 116.



with peoples and races, with tribes and tongues living far away from the villages on the Shire Highlands or along the shores of Lake Nyasa. A striking instance of this occurred several years ago under my own observation—an instance of that feeling of unity and mutual responsibility which is one of the pleasing fruits of Christianity. Thirty years ago, on the occasion of a great famine in India, the members of the young Christian Churches in the Blantyre Mission, on hearing of the sufferings of their fellow-Christians there, “determined to send relief to their brethren” in the Punjab. I have a vivid memory of the sigh of sympathy which arose from my congregation on the Sunday morning when I described to them the straits into which their fellow-Christians in India had fallen. They knew from experience in past years what famine meant, but for the first time in their lives they realized the new bond of brotherhood which Christianity had woven for them with a people in the far-off, hitherto unknown land of India.’<sup>1</sup>

#### Simple Heroism.

‘Dr. Cameron Lees told me of two brothers who came to the University from the Hebrides in a fishing smack, which they moored in the Clyde, and in which they lived together during their Arts course. And I know of another instance which, if written as fiction, would be snorted at as belonging to the “Kailyard School” of literature, but which is absolute fact. In the Outer Isles was a lad of genius, marked by the beauty of saintship; and the goal of his life was clearly accepted by all as the ministry of Christ. But he had no means. His elder brother was a big strong fisherman, and he said, “Don’t mind, Donald dear. A minister you shall be, and preach the love of God to us folk yet.” “But how can I ever?” asked the lad. “This way,” was the reply. “I’ll go to Glasgow, and I’ll be a policeman, and you will live with me, and I’ll see you through.” And that was what happened. Alasdair Mor was easily accepted, and served in the force, faithfully—and always for his brother’s sake. And when Donald came through after a distinguished course, he was called to the parish of his native island, and Alasdair Mor went

back with him; and, till death gave him the promotion he deserved, he served his brother in all humility and gladness as “the minister’s man,” ploughing his glebe, driving him about the parish, having great peace of spirit in the sanctity of loving service. Difficulty and struggle against odds have always made good men grow into touch with such nobility.’<sup>2</sup>

#### Presence of Mind !

‘Not long since, in Glasgow Cathedral, I had to officiate at a wedding of a couple whom I did not know. The place was crowded with guests from everywhere, north and south. It was a fashionable marriage, and English people were present. When the Scripture Lessons were drawing to a close and my part was approaching, I found that I had left in the vestry the paper with the names of the parties. I could not go out to get it, and I could not summon any one to do so. I very rapidly thought the matter over. Was I to ask baldly, “What is your name?”—That moment the reader finished, and I had to take up my part, and when I came to naming each of them, I said, “By what name dost thou come hither, asking this woman to be thy lawful wife?” The man started, and then he poured out a long list of unfamiliar names. I next asked of the bride, “By what name dost thou come hither taking this man to be thy lawful husband.” Like a woman, she at once responded, but also with a long roll of names. Everything proceeded, thereafter, without a hitch. Later, several people spoke of the service; and one lady said, “I never was at a Scottish marriage before, and I think it is most beautiful and moving, especially that bit where you said, ‘By what name dost thou come hither?’ I never heard it in any service hitherto.” I thanked her, and said to myself, “Nor will you probably ever hear it again.”’<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> L. M. Watt, *The Preacher’s Life and Work*, p. xi.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, 149.

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel and the African*, 144.